

TODAY'S SPEECH

APRIL, 1954

50 Cents a Copy

\$1.50 a Year

Published Quarterly

Volume 2 - Number 2

Published by the Speech Association of the Eastern States

In This Issue

ARE YOU SAYING IT RIGHT?

by Marvin G. Bauer 2

MAYBE SO — BUT COUNT ME OUT

by Ralph N. Schmidt 4

MANAGING YOUR CONFERENCE

by Harold P. Zelko 6

ADVERTISING, RHETORIC, AND PUBLIC OPINION

by Ross Scanlon 9

AN ANCIENT WHO IS NOT ANTIQUATED

by Goodwin Berquist 11

WHY DO WE GO TO THE THEATRE?

by Andrew H. Erskine 14

THEATRE OF WESTERN EUROPE, 1953

by John D. Mitchell 16

THREE AMERICAN LADIES OF POESY

by Helen Gertrude Hicks 20

OUR AUTHORS

32



TRENDS IN SPEECH

SIGNIFICANT RESEARCH

TODAY'S SPEECH BOOKS

Speech Is Civilization - - Silence Isolates

Today's Speech

Published quarterly by the Speech Association of the Eastern States; January, April, September, November

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE: Volume I consists of only two numbers, April and October, 1953

VOLUME 2, NUMBER 2

APRIL, 1954

ROBERT T. OLIVER, EDITOR
*The Pennsylvania State University
State College, Pennsylvania*

MARVIN G. BAUER, PRESIDENT
*Brooklyn College
Brooklyn 10, New York*

GORDON HOSTETTLER, EXEC.-SEC.
*Temple University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania*

TRENDS IN SPEECH
CARROLL C. ARNOLD
*Cornell University
Ithaca, New York*

SIGNIFICANT RESEARCH
DAVID C. PHILLIPS
*University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut*

TODAY'S SPEECH BOOKS
ARTHUR EISENSTADT
*Rutgers University
Newark, New Jersey*

BUSINESS MANAGER
HAROLD P. ZELKO
*The Pennsylvania State University
State College, Pennsylvania*

CIRCULATION MANAGER
MILTON J. WIKSELL
*Shepherd College
Shepherdstown, West Virginia*

ADVERTISING MANAGER
ARTHUR EISENSTADT
*Rutgers University
Newark, New Jersey*

Subscriptions provided with membership in the Speech Association of the Eastern States; apply to Executive Secretary. Subscription to non-members, \$1.50 annually. Block subscriptions of 25 or more copies sent to one address, \$1.00 each. Advertising rates on request. Individual sponsorships — \$5.00; organizational sponsorships — \$15.00.

SPONSORS

(For Volume II)

Agnes Allardyce, *Syracuse University*

H. Barrett Davis, *Lehigh University*

Margaret M. Dunn, *Sewanhaka Central High
School, Floral Park, New York*

Deane T. Finne, *City College of New York*

Austin J. Freeley, *Boston University*

S. Morton Giles, *Martin Hall Speech Clinic
Bristol, Rhode Island*

Ruth R. Haun, *University of Pittsburgh*

Helen G. Hicks, *Hunter College*

Robert B. Huber, *University of Vermont*

Ray L. Irwin, *Syracuse University*

Ray E. Keesey, *University of Delaware*

Evelyn Konigsberg, *New York City Board
of Education*

Leroy Lewis, *American Institute of Banking*

Joseph F. O'Brien, *Pennsylvania State University*

Mardel Ogilvie, *Queens College*

Lindsey S. Perkins, *Brooklyn College*

David C. Phillips, *University of Connecticut*

Brooks Quimby, *Bates College*

J. Walter Reeves, *Peddie School*

A. M. Margaret H. Richards, *Berwick Public
Schools, Berwick, Pa.*

Earl H. Ryan, *City College of New York*

Solomon Simonson, *St. U. of N. Y., (Fredonia)*

William S. Tacey, *University of Pittsburgh*

Ruth H. Thomas, *Syracuse University*

Lenora Vaughn-Eames, *President, Speech
Association of New Jersey*

Lloyd W. Weldon, *West Virginia University*

Herbert Wichelns, *Cornell University*

Milton J. Wiksell, *Shepherd College*

Harold Zelko, *Pennsylvania State University*

New York City Speech Association

Pennsylvania State Speech Association

Titan Metal Manufacturing Co., *Bellefonte, Pa.*

An Opportunity

OUR READERS — teachers, businessmen, students, club-women—who are seeking guidance and fellowship in their work in speech can do no better than to be in attendance at the annual convention of the Eastern States Speech Association. Time: April 8-10. Place: Philadelphia, Penn Sherwood Hotel, 39th and Chestnut Streets.

Everyone is welcome and advance registration is not required. Since Thursday is devoted to committee meetings, those in general attendance should plan to be on hand at the registration desk of the Penn Sherwood Hotel at or near 8:30 a. m., Friday, April 9. A registration fee of \$3.50 provides membership in the SAES for a full year, a year's subscription to *Today's Speech*, and admission to the entire galaxy of stimulating and informative meetings.

Social Events

Many members bring their entire families — wives and children old enough to enjoy and profit by the discussions. Since the Penn Sherwood is located at 39th and Chestnut streets, the central downtown shopping and entertainment area lies just outside the front door.

Coffee Hour (get acquainted) in Persian Room, 9:00 to 10:15 a. m., Friday, April 9.

Cocktail Hour (really get acquainted!) in University Room, 4:00 to 6:00 p. m., Friday, April 9.

Association Dinner (no speeches, entertainment instead!) in Pennsylvania Room, 6:00 p. m. Only \$3.25.

Special Luncheons, 12:15, Friday and Saturday.

Business and Committee Meetings

THURSDAY, APRIL 8, at 2:00 p. m. — committees on constitutional revision, finance, publications, public relations, research, and speech education.

—at 3:30 p. m. — Executive Committee, and Eastern Forensic Association.

—at 4:30 p. m. — Committee on state and local oratory.

—at 7:30 p. m. — Executive Committee.

FRIDAY, APRIL 9 — at 8:00 p. m., General Session on problems of the State Speech Associations.

—at 8:00 p. m., business meeting of the Eastern Forensic Ass'n.

—at 9:00 p. m., Executive Committee meeting.

SATURDAY, APRIL 10 — 3:15 p. m., Annual SAES Business Meeting.

—at 4:30 p. m., Executive Committee meeting.

Television

FRIDAY, APRIL 9, at 10:30 a. m. will commence an hour and a half program on "Communication in 1954," telecast over station WFIL-TV, with members of the Association in the studio or gathered before receivers in the Penn Sherwood Hotel. Produced by John B. Roberts of Temple U.

—at 1:00 p. m., address on "Television Today," by John M. Grogan, director of *The Camel Caravan*.

—at 2:45 p. m., "Educational Television," discussion led by John B. Roberts, of Temple.

Public Speaking

FRIDAY, APRIL 9, at 1:00 p. m., session on "Business Speech Training," led by Lindsey S. Perkins, of Brooklyn College, with talks by Clinton C. Johnson, of the Chemical Bank and Trust Co.; Kinsey N. Merritt, of the Railway Express Co.; Earl H. Ryan, City College, N. Y.; and Harold P. Zelko, Penn State.

SATURDAY, APRIL 10, at 10:45 a. m., "The Significance of Speech and the Speech Teacher in Democratic Society," discussed by Harry D. Gideonse, President of Brooklyn College; Fred Canaday, of the General Motors Personnel and Employee Relations Department; and Karl R. Wallace, President of the Speech Association of America.

—at 1:30 p. m., "Possibilities of Progress in Forensics," discussed by Elnora Carrino, Robert Haakinson, Robert Newman, and Austin Freeley.

Speech Therapy

FRIDAY, APRIL 9, at 1:00 p. m. — "Problems in Cerebral Palsy," discussed by Dorothy Doob, Ernest Fleischer, Glen Boles, Loretta Richter, and John Duffy.

—at 2:45 p. m. — the work of the Pennsylvania Speech Therapy Centers will be discussed by Albert Johnson, June Abshire, Anne O'Hagen, and Raymond Lezak.

SATURDAY, APRIL 10, at 9:15 a. m., problems of speech correction in the public schools discussed by Zelda Horner Kosh, Frances Cox, Romaine Mackie, A. Elizabeth Miller, Letitia Raubicheck, Gertrude Wyatt, Geraldine Garrison and Howard Fox.

—at 9:15 a. m., "Therapy for Severe Speech Disorders," discussed by Margaret McCausland, Martin Bordman, Ellen Moore, Murray Halfond, and Frank Bakes.

(Continued on page 32)

Are You Saying It Right?

By Marvin G. Bauer

NOT LONG AGO I attended a labor union meeting in Hawaii. After the main speeches were given, the chairman arose and asked: "Are dere enny udder, fudder queshons?" There were, indeed, "udder" questions, and "fudder" ones, too; questions that dealt with realistic problems faced by those attending the meeting. The chairman entertained the questions, and directed them to a given speaker on the panel. The rights and privileges of the members were spelled out; complications were unravelled; conflicts were resolved. The questions were sometimes poorly phrased, and those asking them seemed awkward and ill at ease. But the *purpose* of the meeting was achieved. When it finally adjourned, there was a general feeling of enlightenment, as well as a sense of satisfaction in belonging to an organization that was endeavoring to help them in their job of making a living.

As I sat in that meeting, I wondered whether or not it would have been materially improved had all the members "said it right" — usually thought of as correctness in grammar, in pronunciation, and in diction. I wondered whether, by and large, people are not too concerned with these aspects of speaking. I thought of my students who invariably ask after giving a speech: "What were my faults?" A few details, such as "You speak too fast," or "You don't look at your audience," or "You say 'ap' for 'up,'" or "Get your hands out of your pockets," too often satisfy them. Seldom does a student ask: "Do you think I accomplished my purpose?" Rarely does he ask: "Did you catch my main point?" And I can not recall one asking: "Did you like the materials of my speech? Did I present sufficient evidence? Did you think it was relevant? Were my examples good?" No. students and most people in general, seem concerned with whether or not they are "saying it right," *i. e.*, right in terms of generally accepted standards of correctness in utterance.

Excellence in these matters is, of course, desirable. But for the best success in communicating with our fellow beings, attention should be given to more basic factors. I am not making a case against skills in speaking. But I am firmly convinced that the average person is too much concerned with the auditory and the visual aspects of speaking, and too little concerned with the forces that produce his utterance in the first place. One

should never forget that in the last analysis the man and the speech are inseparable. The vocal sounds used are but an attempt on the part of the speaker to stimulate in his hearers meaning similar to that held by the speaker. The very language he uses is but symbolism of fact. The speaker's awareness, the depth of his realization, is responsible for the sending forth of his words. The speaker, to be sure, uses visual as well as auditory means for communication; but the forces behind these means are the most important aspect. It is the functioning of the intellectual and the emotional forces of the man himself that constitutes the generating power in the speech situation. The drive of these forces should be of more concern to a speaker than the details of language or the skills he uses in delivery.

An analysis of any model speech will invariably show that the speaker was primarily concerned with the accomplishment of a clearly defined purpose. When Henry W. Grady in 1886 delivered his stirring address *The New South* to a Northern audience, he realized the need for a Southerner to utter in unmistakable terms the desire of the South for harmony and for nationalism. He was essentially concerned with persuading his Northern hearers that the attitude of the South had undergone a significant change. The accomplishment of this purpose was his primary and vital concern; not his Southern diction, nor his voice quality, nor his grammar. The triumph of Grady's speech that night was undeniable evidence that he had "said it right," but it was the force of his ideas that was mainly responsible for his success.

One cannot emphasize too much the strength that comes to a speaker who is well prepared. Preparation implies a careful analysis of the audience, the situation, and the topic discussed. Preparation also demands awareness of the needs of the moment. There is a right time to say the right thing. In addition to this, a person should know that what he is saying has good foundation in fact. It makes a vast difference whether one is maintaining that two plus two equals five rather than four. Yet how many of us are somewhat careless with our statements of fact, while at the same time greatly concerned with the impression our manner of speaking is making. It should be emphasized that there are great psychological benefits to the speaker who is sure of his case. The one who

knows that he knows is able to speak with an authority that is highly convincing. His confidence in what he is saying actually improves his very voice quality, as well as his manner of speaking. The audience somehow feels that the well prepared speaker is "saying it right." The *New South* speech, referred to above, shows evidence of careful preparation, not only in the sense of planning for the specific occasion, but in the larger sense of a man focusing his entire background on the immediate issue at hand. As a matter of fact, after hearing the speakers who preceded him, Grady discarded most of his set speech and delivered an entirely revised version on the spur of the moment. His previous thinking about the subject, together with his careful preparation of the speech he was asked to give, made it possible for him to meet the unexpected psychological demands that arose as the meeting progressed.

Of course, not all speech situations are the formal, public speaking type. There is, for example, the informal discussion carried on among a few people. Even here, one should speak from a background of reliable information if he wishes the best results. And if the discussion is concerned with the solution of a problem, as is so often the case, each speaker should be intent upon analyzing the difficulty, and weighing possible solutions, all with the aim of arriving at a common agreement on the best possible solution of the problem under consideration. A spirit of cooperativeness aids the progress of the discussion. An honest effort to be helpful will be appreciated much more than carefulness in skills. If you are sincere in your desire to make a genuine contribution to the joint effort, and if you are well informed on the problem, you will in all probability when you speak be "saying it right."

In a sense, a speech is an experience *shared* by the speaker and the audience. If any skills can be used to make that sharing process more complete, so much the better. But the human relation

aspect of the speaking experience cannot be overemphasized, for it constitutes the very essence of communication. Check your reaction to the speaker who, even though competent, acts superior to his listeners. Do his techniques or skills compensate for his attitude? On the other hand, compare this reaction with the one you have toward the speaker who thinks with you about a problem and gives to its consideration the best of which he is capable. Sincerity is universally recognized as a highly desirable factor in any attempt to win audiences over to a point of view. Getting on common ground with your listeners is a standard procedure in securing an open-minded hearing for one's proposition. This good will cannot be overlooked in any speech situation. If a speaker is honest in his conviction and proceeds to establish his position with facts, evidence, illustrations, he need not be concerned with his personal deviations from the standards of correctness advocated by the perfectionists. The force of the man himself is far more important than the techniques he uses in the process of communication.

It would be a mistake to assume that effectiveness is achieved solely by the forcefulness of ideas or mainly by the skillful use of techniques. Both content and skill are necessary for the best possible results in communication. The difficulty arises when self-consciousness and embarrassment are experienced because of concern over such matters as grammar, pronunciation, diction, voice, gesture, and personal idiosyncrasies. The nervous energy of the speaker should not be consumed in worry over matters such as these. Let him improve himself in these aspects as time goes on. But when he is actually engaged in a speech situation, he should direct his attention to the basic factors that constitute genuine effectiveness. His concern should be a comprehension of all the forces in the total situation. With this awareness, together with the confidence it engenders, the speaker may proceed with the assurance that in the true sense he is "saying it right."

Some five years ago the Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction sent out a questionnaire to public high schools in the state from which it received 338 replies — 96% of them asserting a desire to provide a course in Speech. The Department has arranged for certification for teachers of Speech, requiring 18 hours of subject-matter specialization. Inquiries may be addressed to Henry Klonower, Director of Teacher Education and Certification, State Department of Public Instruction, Harrisburg, Penna.

"Maybe So — But Count Me Out"

By Ralph N. Schmidt

WHEN ANY MEMBER of your audience says, "Maybe so — but count me out," YOU, Mr. Speaker, have failed with that person!

Why do audiences or individuals in audiences react in this fashion to some of our speeches? We can rationalize our failure, if we wish, and say that they just didn't listen. But, WHY didn't they listen? People don't come to hear a speech with the express intent of *not* listening. Captive, unwilling audiences are the exception and not the rule. Even these are hoping that the speech will be interesting, that it will concern them, that there will be something of value to them, that it will not be a waste of their time. No one comes to a meeting of any kind at which a speech is scheduled saying to himself, "I hope that this will be boring. I hope the speaker will be unintelligible. I want to be made completely miserable by the content and delivery of the speech."

Actually, the audience is kind, hopeful, sympathetic, encouraging, cooperative. People want to be informed, stimulated, aroused, convinced, persuaded, entertained. Members of audiences come to meetings to listen to speeches in order to learn something which will help them. There were other places they might have gone, other things they might have done, but they elected to come to hear YOU.

If they go away saying "Maybe so — but count me out," it isn't because they didn't give you and your proposal as much attention and consideration as you permitted them to give to it. It is, rather, because you didn't help them to see their relationship to your subject. You didn't show them how your proposal concerned them. You didn't make them see that, but for them, you wouldn't have developed the topic — that *they* were in your mind and your planning from the moment you accepted the invitation to speak to them right up to and after the moment you uttered your concluding words on the platform. To be blunt, you were not audience-centered.

Audience-centeredness, not subject-centeredness, is the key to success in speaking. This is no way minimizes the importance of the subject and its treatment. A speaker must have something worthwhile to say. He must have a thoughtful, well organized, factual, logical speech. The points of view he expresses must be sound. Unfortunately, that is not enough. A speech may, and often

does, have all of these characteristics and yet fails. It is a "good" speech — yet does not "ring the bell". One essential characteristic is missing — it is not audience-centered.

Recently I listened to a sermon. The subject as announced in the newspapers, "Religious Faith — Fantasy or Truth?", piqued my curiosity. I determined to be among those present. Despite being stuck in a snow bank, I shoveled out and arrived late, but in time for the sermon. Before the first five minutes of the presentation were over, I was restless. By the time ten minutes had elapsed, I had reason to wonder whether it had been worth the effort I had expended to be able to be present. At the end of the sermon my reaction was "Maybe so — but count me out".

And yet, I had wanted to hear that sermon! I had wanted to be counted among those for whom religious faith was not fantasy — but among those for whom it was truth. What had happened to destroy my interest, to change my intentions?

Not once had the minister given any indication that he was concerned with the problems of the people in the pews. Not once had he shown any interest in our reactions, in our lack of attention. He read, at his own pace, the scholarly paper which he had prepared in the quietness of his study, aloof from the world and its problems. It "smelled of the lamp" and was studded with, I think, well-chosen quotations from the writings of the thinkers, philosophers, psychologists, sociologists and theologians of the past and present. I cannot be sure that they were well-chosen because my mind wandered. I just could not force myself to give continuous attention. Despite my best efforts to concentrate on his message, I found myself thinking about other things.

Although the minister concluded by saying he had just been "thinking out loud" about whether religious faith was fantasy or truth, as a teacher of public speaking, I feel quite sure that he wanted us to come to the conclusion that it *was* truth and that we should cultivate it. I doubt whether any of those who heard him will strive toward cultivation of a deeper religious faith *because* of what they heard. He just didn't "include us in" in his thinking.

Two weeks earlier another minister preached a sermon on pin ball machines. Right now there is an active campaign in our city to outlaw these

"amusement" devices. The Council of Churches is playing an active role. Service and professional clubs are discussing the matter. The grand jury is investigating. The newspapers are giving full publicity to all efforts. Why? What was the difference between these two public speaking efforts?

The second preacher planned his sermon in terms of his congregation and presented it in those terms. His illustrations were selected from the daily life of the community and the relationship between them and his hearers was clearly developed. He made the members of his congregation feel a personal responsibility, made them feel that he expected them as individuals to do something about the conditions which he revealed. As a result, those who agreed with him that the machines are a menace to the morality of the community asked to be "counted in."

By examining samples taken from actual speeches, we can see more clearly the difference between subject-centered and audience-centered speech. The following paragraph was taken from a speech printed in the January 1, 1954 issue of *Vital Speeches*:

Such developments and encroachments in themselves are alarming, but their full significance can be appreciated only as we examine them in relation to the lessons of history and the experiences of other nations. That examination reveals them to be, unmistakably, the expression of a philosophy which has brought economic defeat and destitution to every nation which has embraced it — the philosophy of commandeering by armed power for political purposes the creative time and talent of individuals, and the products of their personal labor, for redistribution in accordance with governmental decisions.

Would you want to listen to more of the same?

Do you feel that it concerns you, that the speaker is interested in you? Or do you say, "May so — but count me out?"

Now read this paragraph, taken from the December 1, 1953 issue of the same publication:

...the psychiatrist and the operator of a food store have much in common. All of us are human; we have certain kinds of wives we have to live with, we have children who sometimes have their problems, and most of us have a job where we are associated with some "eight balls". Daily as we try to live satisfying lives, we are beset by big and little problems in dealing with the people around us — customers, associates, family, strangers. We even have difficulties with ourselves.

The basis for my remarks is what I have learned on my job as a psychiatrist. For many years I spent my daily life trying to understand and help troubled, sometimes ineffective, usually unhappy and sometimes difficult individuals. In one sense, I think you do the same thing as an inevitable, even though incidental, part of your work. I think of you as being on the firing line, seeing the early evidences of maladjustment. I'm sure that within your own organizations you have some difficulties. If you are very wise, you know that you have some difficulties yourself and that you have to wrestle with these in whatever kind of business you're in. . . .

If you were the operator of a food store, would you want to listen? Would you feel that the speech concerned you and that the speaker was interested in you? I would!!

The point is this: If you want to avoid having those who listen to your speeches react by saying "Maybe so — but count me out," *count them in* during the preparation of your speech *and* during its presentation. Be audience-centered!

INDIAN ELOQUENCE

Commenting on the farewell speech given by the Cherokee Indian Chief, Ontassete, to his tribe, before leaving for England, Thomas Jefferson described the effects to John Adams: "The moon was in full splendor and to her he seemed to address himself in his prayers for his own safety on the voyage, and for the welfare of his own people

during his absence. His sounding voice, distinct articulation, animated action, and the solemn silence of his people at their several fires, filled me with awe and veneration, although I did not understand a word he uttered." From Claude Bowyers: *The Young Jefferson*, p. 13.

Managing Your Conference

By Harold P. Zelko

THE PLACE AND VALUE of the conference in today's era of enlightened management is subject to a great deal of serious research and writing, as well as many humorous jibes. The latter take many forms, including cynically humorous definitions:

A conference is a group of people who individually can do nothing but who meet in order to conclude that nothing can be done.

A conference is something at which, after all is said and done, more is said than done.

Now the fact is that even the critics of the conference method would not advocate that the method be abandoned, to be replaced by a completely autocratic system, wherein one person at the head of a group hands down "decrees" and decisions without ever "conferring" with his staff. The alternative of the use of the conference method looms immediately as a return to the extreme boss method of management that we all abhor.

This is not to say that a supervisor or executive should not exercise good judgment as to when he should make a decision himself and when it might best be made after a conference. There may be a tendency in some quarters to resort all too frequently to the plea, "Let's have a conference . . ." But the absence of the use of the method in many organizations leaves a serious gap in the total objective of good management.

I believe we can conclude that what the cynics complain of, therefore, is not the use of the conference method, but the *poor* or *ineffective* use of it. There are simply too many bad conferences!

No less a research group than the Conference Research Center at the University of Michigan concluded that the average executive spends from one-fourth to one-half his total time in conferences, either as a leader or as a participant. There are many very sound reasons for this. Coming back to our term "enlightened management," it is well recognized by supervisors today that their subordinates (no matter at what level of supervision) can usually contribute a great deal to the sound solution of a problem if given a chance to voice their opinions based on their knowledge and experience.

This sum total of knowledge and experience of a work group is worth countless dollars to the supervisor who must make a decision. It is also well

recognized that persons like to feel a sense of belonging to a work group — a feeling that can only be achieved by giving them a chance to participate in the plans and decisions of that group. Again, we know that the conference is a useful tool for transmitting information and instructions through supervisory channels in an organization. The conference is a primary tool in the total communications system. And the fact is that *conferences are here to stay*.

Our quest, then, is not how to do away with conferences but how to improve them. And this immediately raises the question, what's wrong with our conferences?

The faults of most conferences are relatively simple to find, and they usually add up to bad management. This bad management comes about largely because a conference, by its very nature, is an informal communication medium, and there is a natural tendency to feel that it will run itself. But this is definitely not so. Failure to accomplish an objective; disinterested participants; poor physical arrangements; unduly long sessions; or unnecessary friction are usually the result of poor planning, lack of organization, or poor leadership. All of these can be improved through preparation.

A Conference Needs Planning

There are a great many things to do in planning for a successful conference. They involve more than telling your secretary to reserve the conference room for you at 2:00 P. M. or telling her to call your staff and ask them to come to your office "for a few minutes for a conference;" and then proceed to hold them for two hours. There's a reason why the few minutes grew to two hours, perhaps traceable to failure to know the real purpose why they were there (either in your mind or in theirs), or to poor leadership that allowed discussion to trail off into countless channels away from the subject at hand.

All these steps are involved in good planning:

1. *Determine the purpose of the conference.* Is it to get the judgment of the group in helping to solve a particular problem? Or a series of problems? Is it to announce a new policy and get group reaction? Is it to pass on certain information or instructions?
2. *Analyze the group.* Is this your regular staff? Are there some persons present from

other departments? What is the background and interest of this group, and of each of them as individuals, particularly in relation to the subject and purpose of the conference? Should someone else be invited?

3. *Plan the agenda.* What is the best order of subjects to be taken up? How much time on each? To what extent will the group participate?
4. *Notify the persons to attend.* Has everyone been notified? Do they know where and when to come? Do they know what they're coming for? Do they know what is expected of them? Do they know how long the conference will last? Have you sent them a copy of the agenda?
5. *Make a working outline for leading the conference.* What directions to myself can I best put down on paper as a guide during the conference?
6. *Arrange room facilities and equipment.* Is this the best arrangement for face-to-face discussion? For effective leadership? Is there a blackboard or chart easel? Chalk or crayons? Would place cards be of value? Would prepared visual aids make the purpose clearer or help stimulate discussion? Do I have on hand all the reference materials I will need? Do we want minutes kept of the results of the conference?

Any or all of these steps may mean the difference between a good or bad conference. In regard to the purpose to be accomplished, a leader must know whether he wants his group to help him solve a problem (and therefore should encourage them to talk a great deal) or whether he has brought them together to transmit certain information (which will require considerable explanation on his part). He must anticipate this again in terms of the length of the conference and set realistic goals as to what can be accomplished within an announced time limit. He must be sure that all key persons are present so that a decision will not be made that will be meaningless unless a certain individual had been at the meeting. With good planning, he has insured the success of the conference to a considerable extent.

The organization of a conference involves both planning and leadership, for the conference agenda and outline are parts of the planning process; yet their execution depends on good leadership. The agenda is the listing of the conference pur-

pose and topics to be taken up, sometimes showing the time each topic will be reached. This is primarily for notice to the conference participants in advance of the conference. The *outline* is usually more detailed than the agenda and is the leader's working guide for leading the group through the items on the agenda, from the beginning to the end of the conference. It should be in outline form, following a systematic organization pattern in problem-solution sequence if problems are to be taken up; or a logical sequence of topics and points to be made or obtained from the group in the case of an informational or instructional conference objective. On the outline, preferably in the left margin, there should be notes to the leader of particular techniques or methods to employ, such as the use of a CHART or the BLACKBOARD, a TRANSITION to be made or an INTERNAL SUMMARY, a HAND-OUT of material, a CASE or EXAMPLE to be cited as a basis for discussion, a QUESTION or SERIES OF QUESTIONS that will arouse desired responses and stimulate discussion, and other tools the leader may be using.

Conference Notice and Agenda

To:
 We would appreciate your attendance at a conference of
 Place: Date and Time:
 Purpose:
 Others attending: (if appropriate)
 Please be prepared to talk on

Chairman (signed)

Agenda

3:00 P. M.	Conference opening
	Statement of new company policy and problems arising out of this
	Clarification of policy by production manager
3:30	Discussion of problems under new policy
4:00	Proposals for adjusting to new policy for our work unit
	Discussion of proposals
4:30	Agreement on action to be taken
4:45	Announcements and other matters
5:00	Summary and adjournment

Of course the conference outline must be regarded as a *flexible guide* for the organization and continuity of the conference, rather than a rigid pattern. Yet the skillful leader will guide the

group through the organization that he has planned, at the same time accomplishing all his objectives, offending no one, and getting the fullest possible participation from the group.

A Conference Needs Good Leadership

All that has been said up to now has to do with the planning that is necessary as a foundation for the effective leadership of a conference. We have tried to make the point that good conferences usually don't just spring up out of thin air (although on rare occasions the *ad hoc* conference or meeting is necessary and sometimes, by chance, may be successful), but they are the result of careful planning. In the actual conduct of the conference, many things will affect the outcome, and we can only mention some of them briefly:

1. **START ON TIME!**
2. *Establish a pleasant manner.* The start of a conference is important. There must be permissive rather than a restrictive attitude on the part of the leader.
3. *Be group or "you" centered, rather than "I" centered.* The constant concern of the good conference leader is with the group, not with self. He must be aware of group and individual reactions, participation, prejudices, ability to contribute, and other things.
4. *Keep the purpose in mind.* Never lose sight of the purpose of the conference. Every point under discussion should contribute to the purpose in some way.
5. *Determine the relative amount of group talking in relation to your own talking that should be expected.* This will depend in part on the type of meeting and purpose. It will also control the extent to which you want to stimulate group talking.
6. *Lead, stimulate, guide, and control discussion.* This is of course the crux of the successful conference. Knowledge of group members; type of meeting; adroit use of questions, cases, examples, visual aids, and other tools; and the total manner of the leader will all affect the discussion.
7. *Listen.* The good conference leader is a good listener. Otherwise he tends to talk too much himself, is not aware of what is going on, and loses his control of the conference.

9. *Use visual aids when appropriate.* Something seen on a blackboard, chart, or handout will do a great deal toward stimulating discussion.

10. *Answer questions from group.* The skilled conference leader will know when it is appropriate for him to answer a question that has been raised by a group member. Usually this kind of "experting" should be avoided, particularly when the answer to the question can be obtained by "throwing it back" to the group.

11. *Keep records and send to members.* A brief, clear statement of the conclusions reached forms a valuable, permanent record for the participant's (and leader's) files.

12. **ADJOURN ON TIME!**

One aspect of decision-making in conferences and meetings, the use of parliamentary law in arriving at group decisions, has recently received interesting and challenging attention¹ by an outstanding writer in this field. After the generally accepted use of parliamentary law in most business meetings was challenged as being cumbersome and outmoded, this writer explains the true value of parliamentary motions and their application to different types of groups.

To say that parliamentary law should be discarded in reaching all group decisions, or to say that it should always be used in all types of meetings would present extremes that are equally bad. With regard to its use in the business conference, most authorities agree that the "consensus" of the group should be obtained without formal motion and vote wherever possible. Since motions tend to confine discussion to the particular rules of procedure applicable to the particular motions; and since voting tends to crystallize majority and minority and bring out "sides," they are discouraged in small groups in favor of a completely free and "permissive" atmosphere in which to talk. Whether or not this is entirely sound may be open to question, but for the small, face-to-face conference group it probably makes for better results. Obviously, although this practice relieves the leader (and group members) from the obligation to know parliamentary law, it places a real responsibility on him to 1) keep the discussion systematic and orderly without formal motions, and 2) make sound summaries and draw conclusions that will accurately reflect group consensus.

Managing your conference, then, demands an understanding of the place and use of the conference method, careful planning, and expert leadership. Just a little attention to some of these principles and suggestions is bound to make your conference more successful.

NOTE

- ¹ Joseph F. O'Brien, "Don't Shove, Mr. Knowles—Parliamentary Law is Basically Sound," *Today's*

Speech, Volume II, Number 1, January 1954. See also, by the same writer, *Parliamentary Law for the Layman*, Harper & Brothers, 1952.

For an expanded treatment of conference principles, see Harold P. Zelko, *How to Hold Meetings and Conferences*, (pamphlet), National Foreman's Institute, New London, Connecticut, 1951.

Advertising, Rhetoric, and Public Opinion

By Ross Scanlan

AT TIMES during the last presidential campaign it seemed as if we were witnessing a contest between a speaker and an advertising company. Of course, if the Democrats had had more money to spend, the campaign might have turned into a contest between *two* advertising companies. As a writer in *The Reporter* magazine for October 27, 1953, observes, "public relations men and their close relatives, advertising men, have moved into politics in a big way," and their duties "have now come to include the planning of entire campaigns and even, most recently, the conduct of government."

We ought not to need an observer to point out the trend to us. While the campaign was on, we all heard radio and television programs where complex issues of taxation, corruption, and the high cost of living were handled in "spot announcements" with much of the synthetic emphasis that goes into selling beverages and tobacco. If laymen are not aware of the growing responsibilities of advertising, the advertisers themselves are. Last March, at a meeting of the Association of National Advertisers, Dr. Ernest Dichter, president of the Institute for Research in Mass Motivations, Inc., told his listeners, according to a report in the *New York Times*, that the same techniques "used in the selling of goods are applicable to urgent social issues."

And, of course, Dr. Dichter is quite right. It would be egg-headed in a most unflattering sense of that term to try to cut back anything so inevitable in these days of mass communication as the invasion of the political field by advertisers. Advertising men and their methods are a dominant part of mass communication, and mass communication must serve political as well as

commercial ends. The appearance of the advertiser on the political scene is an act of nature. We have come a long way from the time when a philosopher could define democracy as "an aristocracy of orators."

But, if it is egg-headed to view the new trend with alarm, it is hard-headed in no complimentary sense of *that* term, to view it with complacency. Even in its original function of selling commodities, advertising is a mixed blessing for the society in which it operates. It droppeth as a torrential downpour from heaven upon the place beneath; it blesseth and abuseth him that takes. One is reminded of the country preacher who prayed for rain in time of drought, and when it rained for forty days and nights stood again in the field, in water up to his waist, and said: "I thank Thee that Thou hast heard my prayer, but, Lord, *this* is ridiculous."

Its defenders can point to modern advertising as a necessity of our economy. Advertising performs the important task of making people aware of the services commerce can render them. It keeps the wheels of industry turning. It creates a place for mass production, increases employment, lowers the cost and raises the standard of living, provides an incentive for technological developments, and by benefiting our economy contributes to the power of this country to defend itself against foreign enemies.

If only that were all it did! Unfortunately, the critics of advertising can point to other things. The very power of advertising rests in large part upon over-simplification of relevant materials, calculated distraction from main issues where these issues are embarrassing to a desired decision or action, an often ruthless exaggeration of claims,

and a remorseless repetition of emphatic appeals. In commerce the public puts up some spotted resistance to these operations when it enacts a pure food and drug law, establishes a federal trade commission and a bureau of standards — taking care to keep these in dependable hands — and avails itself here and there of reports by independent consumers' research organizations.

But, on the whole, we tolerate a great deal more than we resist. We have a long tradition of high-pressure salesmanship in this country; and advertising is simply high-pressure salesmanship geared to a mass communication media. If we choose to take a benign attitude toward commercial advertising, we can probably convince ourselves that relatively few injuries can result where the question is one of buying or not buying various commodities or where the decision is between brand X and brand Y. We are probably not willing to carry our tolerance so far as to bring about a public revival of the slogan, *caveat emptor*, but neither are we ready to go much farther than we have gone to condone the effects of advertising.

Yet, however and wherever we tolerate advertising methods in commerce, we must feel some reluctance to see such tactics brought wholesale into the field of political action. Political decisions involve questions of peace and war, freedom and tyranny, justice and injustice, even personal questions of innocence and guilt. Here is something more than a choice of commodities or brands. Here are problems that require the most carefully calculated systems of reaching judgment and action, by the public as well as by their leaders.

The ancient world developed the rhetoric of debate and discussion as the best available method of democratic thinking. To be sure, rhetoric has never been a perfect problem-solving technique. All the false, though generally effective, tactics of modern advertising have their counterparts in the history of rhetoric. From the days of the ancient sophist down to the present, practicing rhetoricians have often shown how easy it is to mislead the people by oversimplification of complex issues, by distracting public attention from embarrassing considerations, by a patent and shameless exaggeration of claims and accusations, and by incessant repetition of a few slogans.

On the other hand, there is a practical and very fundamental difference between advertising and rhetoric. Advertising may not be able to rise above the methods described. Rhetoric can and often has. Early in the history of rhetorical theory the

great service performed by Plato in his *Phaedrus*, by Aristotle in his *Rhetoric*, and by Romans like Cicero and Quintilian who took up the concept of "the good man speaking" proved the capacity of rhetoric to rise above primitive levels. Unfortunately, much modern advertising is at the same moral and intellectual level as ancient rhetoric may have been when Plato wrote the *Protagoras* and the *Gorgias*. No one has written a *Phaedrus* or a *Rhetoric* for modern advertising, and it is difficult to see how anyone can.

We cannot keep the advertiser out of political questions any more than we can prevent certain practitioners of rhetoric from prostituting their art. But we can recognize that rhetoric will always hold out opportunities for substantial intellectual and moral effort. It will always be better to analyze the preservation of the American Union through the rhetoric of a Webster and a Hayne than through the competitive efforts of rival advertising companies.

The consequences of turning over the historic functions of debate to the advertisers cannot be good for democracy. Let no one say in rebuttal that the end justifies the means. Even when advertising techniques are put to "good" uses, some of the results will be bad. The objection is not simply moral; it is logical as well. Almost any means we employ to achieve political decision will have more than one consequence; and where the means are bad some of the consequences will be bad.

What are some of the undesirable consequences in a shifting trend from rhetoric to advertising? First, we must make an important decision about the public, about the capacity of people to form intelligent political decisions. If, like Adolf Hitler, we think the average man is politically stupid and indifferent and must always remain so, then, like Hitler, we will concentrate on what he called "Political advertising" and, like him, we will draw our conception of political persuasion from commercial advertising posters. Reread chapter six in volume one of *Mein Kampf*.

If, like Aristotle, we postulate that the average citizen, given facts and analyses, can generally form an intelligent opinion, we shall always keep to something like his conception of rhetoric as the best method of forming opinion in democratic society. The worst thing about most advertising is that it so obviously proceeds from a low regard for public intelligence. If we share in that low opinion, logically we should give up even lip-

service to democracy. If, like Dr. Stockman in Ibsen's *An Enemy of the People*, we believe that "the fools are in a terrible overwhelming majority all the world over," we should, in all conscience, stop trying to maintain government of the people and by the people. But by then we are not too far from the modern dictator's philosophy that public opinion is only an evil necessity of modern government and that it must be handled by whatever means are efficient.

Debating has long been recognized as a method of public political instruction. If, for most of the people, the advertiser takes over the function of the debater, public political education will suffer. What kind of political instruction can come from competition, however spirited, between rival advertising companies? In all the changing forms of democracy there is one constant element: opposition. If the opposition in our democracy becomes one more advertising company, using the same methods as its enemy, the people will get little political instruction from attending to debates.

The worst of all kinds of political ignorance is that which deceives itself into thinking it is knowledge. Under Hitler's and later Goebbels' organized drive for high-pressure advertising methods, the ordinary Nazi was gulled into thinking he had a special insight into complex political problems. The rank and file of Nazi followers, imbued with a few slogans and meaningless generalities, mistook themselves for political experts.

Moreover, no government, totalitarian or demo-

cratic, is above the effects of the methods it uses. One way or another these methods will catch up with the government itself. Hitler's conspicuous and ultimately disastrous self-confidence did not come entirely from his extraordinary egotism. Very early in his political activity he clearly recognized the power of intensive advertising in modern society. From this he might easily have concluded that no mistakes on his part, such as the abortive Munich *putsch*, and no incompetence on the part of his regime but could be covered up by a vigorous application of "public relations" techniques. Thus, the very power of advertising becomes one of its greatest political dangers.

What can we do about all this? Obviously, we cannot prevent the advertiser from pushing his way into the political scene. No political party in America can afford to ignore the services of the advertising man. If there is a way to prevent American democracy in the 20th century from becoming "an aristocracy of advertising men," it lies in our educational systems. If people are not trained at all levels of education to understand the political importance of debate, they are not being trained in democracy. If education for citizenship does not include a developed awareness of the tactics of the political advertiser, our people will be highly susceptible to such tactics, and we shall be ruled by the aggressive advertiser. It is up to those persons who are in charge of our educational institutions to decide whether the average citizen can distinguish one method of persuasion from another.

An Ancient Who Is Not Antiquated

By Goodwin Berquist

TO CONSULT THE PAST is often of value in planning present action. For instance, when a banker considers making a loan to a person in need, one very important factor in his judgment is that person's credit rating, his *past* ability to repay obligations on time. Likewise, the economist forms his opinion about the course of current business trends by relating them to similar trends in the *past*. The business executive, also, regulates production schedules in the light of *past* consumer demand.

In all of these professions, effective communication is a fundamental requirement. Frequently, the banker, the economist of the businessman

finds himself poorly equipped for the public speaking task required of him. A need exists for precise, practical suggestions for the preparation of effective speeches. Is it not likely that the *past* may once again offer the solution to a present need?

Today's speech teachers rely heavily upon the works of Aristotle, Cicero and Quintilian. Yet the non-professional speaker often has neither the time nor the inclination to glean the significant matter from such sources. Besides, all three of these contributors owe much of their material to a single great predecessor. The specific purpose of this paper is to enumerate several of those princi-

ples of the ancient world's greatest speech teacher — principles as valid today as in the time of their origin.

This often neglected pioneer of speech theory is, of course, Isocrates of Athens. Of Greece's ten greatest orators, five were his pupils, while he himself was a sixth. Men from every major profession in existence in the fourth century B. C. came to hear him. Historians, archaeologists, poets, philosophers, generals and princes all studied under the Athenian *rhetor*. From the shores and islands of the Aegean, from the cities of Sicily and Asia Minor, and from the distant colonies on the Black Sea came those who thirsted for Isocratean learning.

But what kind of a man was this powerful teacher? How was it that he achieved his position of influence? And what was the nature of the influence that Isocrates exercised? Let us examine the available evidence.

Born in 436 B. C., Isocrates was the son of a prosperous Greek capitalist, the owner of a knife factory. As a youth he was given the best education his city could afford, and in his early twenties was even sent north to Thessaly to study under the great Sicilian scholar, Gorgias. In the midst of the most brilliant period of Athenian history, Isocrates planned a career of public service as an orator, for the orators alone could count on a pervading influence in the councils of state.

Imagine the disappointment of the young office-seeker, therefore, when natural physical limitations prevented him from pursuing the career for which he had spent his early life preparing. For Isocrates was possessed of a weak voice, a characteristic clearly unfavorable to a profession based on oral communication. Coupled with this difficulty was that of "stage fright"; the young man who was to become so great a private teacher was unusually shy before a public audience.

Since a leading role in the affairs of his native city was closed to him, and since his father's property had been largely destroyed in the costly Peloponnesian War, Isocrates sought his living as a ghost-writer of court speeches. In many respects this occupation corresponds to the work of an English barrister today. Three others of the ten great Attic orators, including the noble Demosthenes, were also so engaged. After several years Isocrates discontinued composing legal orations for others, and applied himself to prescribing rules for speaking and reducing them into a forensic system.

In time this interest in methodical arrangement led Isocrates to relinquish the law court for the classroom. Within a small, select circle he became the teacher of a new type of political action, a philosophy of politics wedded to speech and to a culture more moral than anything contemporary Athens had to offer. Like his eighteenth century admirer, Edmund Burke, Isocrates was fundamentally a conservative. Many times he criticized the excesses of Athenian democracy, especially political demagoguery; he launched logical attacks against the sham pretenses of many of his fellow teachers; often he would ridicule those philosophic speculations which advocated "an origin to all things;" and he always maintained that ideas are of value only as they can be translated into action.

His student body was composed of those who were later to play major roles in the affairs of Greece. A common teacher of the nation's leaders was bound to exercise a wide influence. When such teaching was based on an improved code of personal morality and upon faith in the unification of Greece as a solution to the common problems of the disorganized city states, Isocratean influence became both progressive and practical. Added to all these assets was the fact that Isocrates' school flourished for over half a century (until his death in 338 B. C.). Thus, the training offered by "the old man eloquent" was characterized by wide scope, nobleness of moral tone, thoroughness of method, and encouragement of meaningful work. Here was a practical, rational system, comprehensive in its effort to bring students into contact with all the professions and duties of life.

Such an educational philosophy was speech-oriented. Throughout his life, Isocrates insisted that persuasive speech offers the best medium for molding the political and ethical ideas of an age. Furthermore, he taught that the power of speech rests not upon mere rules or technicalities of rhetoric, but upon rational ideas and knowledge. Speech, thus interpreted, becomes not a mere embellishment, but a precision instrument for *practical* use in political and business affairs.

The ancient rhetorician pictured the duties of the speech teacher as follows: a) he should teach an insight into the "ideas" or basic patterns out of which every speech is built; b) he should train speakers in the right choice and placement of the "ideas"—and particularly in the selection of the correct moment for their presentation; c) he

should emphasize good taste and appropriateness as criteria for the selection of supports for his main ideas; d) he should stress euphony by a rhythmic arrangement of words; e) he should expound every discipline that can be taught rationally; and (f) he should himself serve as a model for student imitation.

To the aspiring public speaker, Isocrates proposed that he become a union of orator, statesman and philosopher. The greater a man's desire to persuade his audience, he maintained, the more he will train himself in aesthetic and moral culture, and in gaining the esteem of his fellow citizens. The educated man must have a faculty for hitting on the right course of action. He must know how to behave in society, and must treat everyone with gentleness and fairness. He must show self-control both as regards pleasure and as regards the gifts of fortune, taking pride only in the results of his own efforts and intelligence. Finally, he must maintain an attitude of mind that is interested in the facts of life, especially, the relations of things in their context. Upon such a background Isocrates built his ideal public speaker.

To such a man the Athenian offered these principles of speech composition.

1. Obtain your inspiration from rational ideas and knowledge. If what you say is to have a practical value, your main ideas must be rooted in personal experience and common sense.
2. What you have to say, your topic, should be partially determined by the time and occasion of your speech.
3. Personal good taste should regulate the particular placement or order of ideas in a speech.
4. Wherever possible, use rhythmic arrangement of words, remembering always to take common, well-known terms rather than academic or intellectual ones. The master specifically enjoined his students to speak "... as all men are apt to think they could if

they would, but as none can do without toil or application."

5. Use short phrases as often as possible.
6. Implement the harmonious structure of words with a musical management of the voice. In other words, aid the rhythmic emphasis of your speech by vocal modulation.
7. Avoid the dissonance of harsh vowel combinations.
8. A valuable stylistic device is parallelism in sound and structure, the first being achieved by rhyming words and the second by synonymous word order in successive passages.
9. Strive for animated figures of speech by applying comparative similes, metaphors, etc. to common human experiences.
10. Know your audience, for without this knowledge affecting or influencing listeners will prove difficult if not impossible.

In conclusion, the writer has attempted to list those precepts of Isocrates' teaching relevant to the problem of modern speech composition. By a brief description of Isocrates' life and opinions, an effort has been made to substantiate the claim that at least one of the great Greek orators is not outdated. No, the ancient "father of eloquence" is not antiquated!

SUGGESTED READINGS

- Burnet, John, *Greek Philosophy: From Thales to Plato*. London: Macmillan, 1932.
- Jaeger, Werner, *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1944, 3 vols.
- Jebb, R. C. *Attic Orators*. London: Macmillan, 1893, Vol II.
- Mahaffy, J. P. A. *History of Classical Greek Literature*. New York: Harpers, 1880, Vol. II.
- Norlin, George. *Isocrates*. London: W. M. Heinemann, Ltd., 1928, 2 vols.
- Robbins, R. D. C. "Isocrates," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, XXXV (1878), pp. 401-24, 593-618.
- Wagner, Russell H. "The Rhetorical Theory of Isocrates," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, VIII, 1922, pp. 323-337.

Why Do We Go To The Theatre?

By Andrew H. Erskine

LONG HAired INTELLECTUALS are often heard sneeringly to term this or that Broadway offering "an escape drama," meaning that the offending show is designed to soothe the tired businessman by providing him with an escape from the realities of his daily life. The basic hypothesis of this article is that all dramatic presentations—on the stage, on the screen, on TV—are for probably ninety per cent of their viewers means of "escape" from reality.

First, let us dispose of the ten per cent for whom the drama is something else. The fact must be faced that, wherever a production has any "snob" appeal, a sizeable part of the audience attends simply to gain status by being seen at the production or by being able to say that they have seen it. To substantiate this statement one need only attend a grand opera, a highly praised musical, or a prize-winning legitimate drama on stage or screen. It is evident from the bored conduct, the inattention, the late arrivals and early departures that many of the attenders do not care a rap about the performance. What they are there for is to gain kudos from having been seen there and demonstrated their support of a cultural cause.

Yes, a sizeable part of any audience is made up of such perfunctory ticket holders, and the greater the "intellectual" appeal of the production the greater is their proportion. Why don't they stay away and let us escapists enjoy our escape without being disturbed by their tramping, their giggling, their yawning, their chattering?

A less offensive minority, often so small as to be counted in decimals of one per cent, is a group of people professionally interested in the theatre. Such people attend to learn something about techniques, whether of scene painting, acting, or directing. As has been mentioned, their number is small and they, being earnest students, are quiet people and trouble the rest of us not at all.

Having disposed of the probable ten per cent, let us turn to the ninety per cent who are escaping via the drama from their everyday lives. Of course many people, usually the more intellectual, who fall into this category would strenuously deny that they did. "Nonsense!" they would say, "we patronize the drama" (often pronounced with a very broad A) "to be stimulated intellectually." They

would cite the fact that they would rather die than attend *Dial M for Murder* ("although, of course, dear Mr. Evans was a most exciting Hamlet") and that they only patronize such "deep" dramas as the profundities of Messers. Elliott and Williams. Even Lilian Hellman is too obscure for them.

But aren't they really escaping, too? The fact is that their own lives are so dismally simple and normal, their personal problems so unexciting or unsolvable that they must live vicariously through psychiatric situations. In addition, the problem of trying to hunt out the playwrights' obscure meanings is in itself, for some people, a diversion from trying to solve their own problems. Isn't this so-called "intellectual" approach to the drama, in essence, exactly the same as that of the ten-year old boy who munches popcorn at the western serials; as that of the shop girl who chews gum through the love affairs of sleek, well-dressed Hollywood heroines; as that of the balding businessman who watches bug-eyed at the burlesque show, that is, if he is in a strange city or for other reasons likely to escape identification? Aren't all these people going to their favorite forms of drama for the same reason — namely to escape from the tensions engendered by the problems of their own lives?

This is not to say that the release mechanisms are the same in all cases. The highbrow finds his release in a form of intellectual exercise. It is perhaps more lasting in that long after the performance he can enter into learned wrangles with like-minded people about the precise meaning of this or that line, thereby freeing his mind for a time of his own worries about his budget or the progress of his Ph. D.

On the other hand, a psychologist would say that the small boy is finding his release from the restraints of home and school in identifying himself with Roy Rogers or some gang-busting detective who is strong enough to beat up the school principal with one hand and Dad with the other. By projecting himself into the identity of his hero, little Willy becomes strong enough, smart enough, and brave enough to subdue all who stand in his way. Of course, the lights go up and he again becomes seventy-five pound Willy — neither smart enough nor brave enough to mas-

ter his world. But he has had the release of fantasy and he can hold on until next Saturday or at least until Frontier Playhouse comes on TV.

At her own level of interest, the shop girl is enjoying release through fantasy. She, like everyone else, finds her daily life frustrating. Her achievements and her possessions fail to keep pace with her ideals and her wants. Hence she goes to the celluloid theatre to project herself into the characterizations offered by the Marilyn Monroes. The film heroine wears "dreamy" clothes and has her man (a handsome, wealthy chap most likely) or gets him in the course of the drama. Having vicariously enjoyed the heroine's success, Sally Shopgirl can go back to her ribbon counter, her basement-bargain clothes, and her humdrum boy-friend. Her anxieties being momentarily forgotten, her tensions have been released.

The foregoing examples seem innocuous and socially acceptable. But what about the *afficionados* of the burlesque houses? In the main they are not employing identification as a release mechanism. (Have you ever known a business man who projected himself into the character of the strip-teaser? If so, notify Kinsey.) To understand the drive which assembles men in burlesque houses, it is only necessary to analyze the clientele. The males seem to fall into three main groupings. First, the college boys. They may be there to enjoy a minor but public defiance of the mores of their family. Mother would be shocked and so would Dad, if he didn't remember when he did the same thing himself. Doing something that would shock the "old folks" is tension-reducing, even if they don't know about it. It is rather like scribbling four-letter Anglo-Saxon words on back fences, which Joe College did at an earlier age.

A second group which patronizes burlesque is made up of older bachelors whose economic position or family responsibilities prevent their marrying. They come from lonely rooms or unhappy parental roofs to get a mild sexual outlet and to escape into a world of noise and color, however raucous it may be.

The third group which attends the burlesque consists of the middle-aged married men. It would be nice to close our eyes and say that all marriages are perfect, that no man — or woman — ever longs for a more attractive mate. The yearning may not be a twenty-four hour a day preoccupation, but it comes, however briefly. Then if a bunch of long-stemmed beauties (they may be

rather repulsive off-stage) are cavorting in a local theatre or night club, off goes Mr. Businessman or Dr. Professional. He comes back to office, country-club, and hearth, his tensions released and ready to face reality, having avoided any number of infinitely less socially acceptable solutions to his marital dissatisfaction. Of course some domestically contented older men go to burlesques and night-clubs for other reasons. They may go in the same spirit as they go to college reunions — to escape the present by retreating into the past and reliving youthful experiences.

* * * * *

At this point you, the reader, may be saying, "I don't fit into any of these categories. I'm not an intellectual. I'm not a ten-year old boy or a shopgirl. I'm happily married and would be bored with a burlesque show. Where do I fit in? Why do I go to the theatre?"

If you don't go to learn technique or for snob appeal, the chances are you go to escape reality and consequently to relieve tension. You saw *South Pacific* a couple of years ago and enjoyed it. You saw *Dial M for Murder* last season and enjoyed it. You saw *Cyrano* in November and *The Shrike* in December and enjoyed them both. This is a varied dramatic menu, not too arty but mature and decent.

Quite true, but let us look at their appeals for Mr. Averageman. Take *South Pacific*. Maybe you didn't project yourself into Mr. Pinza's role and hold Mary Martin in your arms. But it had an exotic setting, an interesting story and tuneful music, a combination powerful enough to make Mr. Averageman forget for a while the cares of his everyday life. Or consider *Dial M for Murder*. Won't you admit to yourself that on occasion you've had a momentary urge to commit murder? Didn't you get a bit of homicidal satisfaction out of watching that play, at the same time feeling secure that the police wouldn't be knocking on your door? In short didn't you enjoy vicariously the thrill of crime without suffering its penalties? And *Cyrano*. Didn't your sword hand twitch a little during the duel? Didn't you identify yourself just a bit with Cyrano the wit, Cyrano the lover?

With *The Shrike* the appeal is different. The setting and situation are not exotic; the only crime is attempted suicide; and the hero is anything but glamorous. Why did you like it? Could it be that here you saw the engrossing problem of

one whose life was infinitely worse than yours and yet he hung on and endured all things? Didn't seeing him endure help you to escape from your troubles and preoccupations? After it was over, didn't your life seem more interesting?

It seems likely, then, that the theatre is for all but a few of us an escape mechanism. It enables us to project ourselves into a different world or to identify ourselves with a character who does

things we would like to do but which we cannot do or will not do because of the penalties involved. In short, the drama — from ancient Greece to Broadway; on the stage, on the screen, on TV — is one of man's most socially acceptable safety valves for the pressures of life. When Utopia comes and every man is free from all tensions and anxieties, then there will be no more need, perhaps, for the drama. But Utopia still seems a long way off.

Theatre of Western Europe, 1953

By John D. Mitchell

IN VIEWING THE THEATRES abroad, I am happy to say that there continues to be much to admire, to wonder at, and to emulate. We know well the decentralization of the theatre in many European countries, the splendid state theatres, the repertory theatres, (both commercial and subsidized,) and it may be some cold comfort to hear that they are plagued with the same economic ills which have beset the American theatre: competition from mechanized forms of entertainment, production costs, inflation, conflicts with trade unions and scarcity of new scripts. Europeans are eager to know what is being done in the United States, as I think we are desirous of knowing what they are testing and attempting to do, to combat these chronic ills of the theatre. The International Theatre Institute, the *World Theatre* publication, and the newly formed International Amateur Theatre Association facilitate exchange of such information.

The source of the strength of the theatre in Europe is its tradition. Ironically, tradition is likewise at the root of its weakness. Tradition which becomes sacred, admitting of no need for re-evaluation, for change, weakens and in time becomes the dry-rot destroying theatre. Tradition excuses ignorance, becomes the front for *chauvinism*.

I think that there is on the one hand a good theatre tradition in the United States, or the professional American theatre with its economic wastefulness would have succumbed long ago. Also, a tradition for *tributary* theatre has kept American theatre alive and growing. But we, too, have a traditional resistance to change, a disinclination to experiment, a no-government-aid-to-the-arts policy. Let us look abroad.

The English Stage

The renaissance of post-war English theatre has settled down to a most substantial reality. It is not a perfect theatre, nor a completely healthy theatre. Perhaps no theatre ever was.

The Arts Council of Great Britain continues to assist and to encourage production of the classics, experimentation in new poetic drama and regional theatres. There are two phenomena of special interest. One is utilization of long-dark suburban theatres. Away from London's West End, the Lyric Hammersmith has established a record of artistic achievement. This past season Sir John Gielgud and a company of actors of stellar rank did a series of plays of interest to themselves as actors, and a value to a well-rounded English theatre. Lower rental for a suburban theatre, somewhat lower production costs — which is passed on to the public — have made possible such definitive productions as the seldom produced *Venice Preserved*. Name-brand quality plus lower cost for seats drew the English theatre-going public to the suburbs. Perhaps with the success of the Lyric Hammersmith in mind, Donald Wolfitt this year presented a repertory of classics at the suburban Kings Theatre. *Airs on a Shoestring*, a topical revue at the suburban Royal Court Theatre, has confirmed what can be achieved outside London's commercial theatre center. I think it raises a very interesting question for us. Might we not re-examine candidly why similar adventures have failed in American theatre? New York's so-called subway circuit has not been an adequate test of suburban theatre in the United States.

The second interesting phenomenon is the sub-

scription theatre. Some of us may have seen the splendid work of the Arts Theatre. In the heart of the West End, over the years its full seasons of productions have introduced new plays like *The Lady is not for Burning* by Christopher Fry, revivals of significant minor plays like those of Pinero, and re-studied presentations of the classics of world theatre.

And now, throughout London, there have mushroomed countless small subscription theatres. They have the advantage of being able to give performances on Sunday, playing late and as clubs keeping their bars open beyond the early closing of the public cafes and pubs. But their sizeable audiences must be made up of more than hard drinkers and the enemies of the blue laws. They offer employment to actors between engagements and opportunities for young players and writers.

The pat explanation for the willingness of the English play-goer to travel to the suburbs, to subscribe for a season of plays, to cross the Thames to the unfashionable South Bank for the classics of the Old Vic, is again tradition. The English, we are told by all, traditionally have sought entertainment at the theatre. This is a weighty factor to be reckoned with. However, I for one am reluctant to subscribe to the view that Europeans are more cultured, more intellectual than Americans. If in one part of the world men and women are moved by pity and fear, laughter and scorn, I am optimistic that men and women have the same reactions and needs in another part of the world. At least, it merits evaluation, and testing. If tradition does maintain for the English theatre a loyal audience despite the rising cost of admission, the discomfort of old theatres, the growing popularity of television, and the low price of admission for the cinema, it may also account for the English musical; it takes tradition and blind loyalty to sit through the sticky sentimentalities, the banal plots and characterizations of these creaking museum pieces about old Ruritania. The American musical in the West End, now so popular, should result in the putting out to pasture of these old theatrical war-horses. But the forces of reaction in the English theatre are not taking it lying down. Much of the pressure on *British Actors Equity* to raise a wall between the English and American theatre comes from this sector of English theatre. Some musical comedy people in London wish to drive from the boards the American musical comedy. Thinking people of the English stage are alarmed and propose to fight, but if *our* Actors

Equity persists in excluding English actors and companies of actors, we strengthen the forces they fight. It is ironic to find it is the Canadians, Australian, and South African members of the *British Equity* who are most vocal for excluding the Americans, while it is the British expatriates of twenty and thirty years residence who are trying to exclude their fellow countrymen from the U. S. theatre. If an iron-curtain descends between our two theatres, both will suffer, of that we may be sure.

MEN OF LETTERS

During the post-war renaissance of English theatre, which Englishmen hope will blossom into another Elizabethan age, royal patronage, the Arts Council, the subscription theatres, and the commercial theatre have encouraged such poets as T. S. Elliot and Christopher Fry, and such novelists as Graham Greene and Aldous Huxley to write for the stage.

There was a time when the great men of letters wrote primarily or exclusively for the theatre: Sophocles, Shakespeare, Moliere. That was a good tradition. When other literary forms grew in importance the theatre declined or became outmoded. Nevertheless, the tradition held in some countries, and many famous novelists never wholly abandoned the theatre. Ironically, the prestige of our novelists abroad is the envy of European letters. Yet, they rarely if ever write for our theatre. Might we not invite them into the temple of Dionysis to test their powers?

What may discourage the novelist from writing for the theatre is the relatively short life in most countries of even an unusually successful play. An esteemed novel on the other hand, is readily accessible to all and can enjoy a very long life.

The Living Room by Graham Greene of this London season, *Sud* by Julien Green, *Asmodee* by Francois Mauriac, and *Le Maître de Santiago* by Motherlant reveal that these novelists have by no means as yet learned to work easily and successfully under the disciplines of the theatre. Yet I am confident that they plan to stay with the theatre until they may meet its challenge. The reasons undoubtedly are many and complex, but one factor which must encourage them to try again is the respectful and sympathetic critiques their plays elicited. They were the criticisms the work of a distinguished man of letters deserves. To my knowledge, no wise-cracking journalist posing as critic exploited their plays, thereby driving them from the theatre.

THE FRENCH THEATRE

Francois Mauriac's twenty-year old play *Asmodee*, revived this season at the Comedie Francaise, created as much theatre shop talk as did the latest hit of a boulevard theatre, and all contemporary French writers must be encouraged by this possibility that any one of their plays may one day enter the repertory of the Comedie Francaise.

There can be no disputing that the brightest jewel in the diadem of French theatre is the Comedie Francaise, where direction and discipline, lacking in most commercial productions in Paris, are highly developed arts. This season's new productions of Corneille's *Le Menteur*, with its traditional stylized acting, on the same bill with Jules Renard's *Poil de Carotte*, with acting of cinematic realism, demonstrated vividly the brilliance and the flexibility of the actors of the Maison de Moliere.

The physical productions given most plays in France, the ballet, the opera, and the performing of most music are all shockingly poor. I attribute these weaknesses in direction, decor, lighting, and disciplines of acting to an historic indifference on the part of Frenchmen to non-French culture. Traditionally, for the Frenchman, there is no culture save French culture; for him no theatre outside his country exists. He might improve certain areas of French theatre by seriously looking at other world theatres and their productions.

THEATRE IN THE LOWLANDS

Much might be said of the theatre of the lowlands, Holland and Belgium. Both countries have state theatre and commercial theatres. The theatre of The Netherlands is not as centralized as in England, France and the United States. For a small country, Holland has several subsidized theatres strategically placed throughout its small confines. For example, The Hague has a state theatre with a resident company of quality, variety and strength. It is by no means overshadowed by the state theatre of the capital, Amsterdam. In return for subsidy, the state theatres have the responsibility of touring extensively throughout the country. Although it is arduous for the actors and the theatre personnel, they accept good-naturedly their duty and recognize that it is keeping the theatre alive and building the necessary audience for Dutch theatre of the future.

Occasional work of an actor or actress may achieve greatness, but the theatre of Holland cannot be said to be great by world standards. Perhaps it stems from the lack of a long theatre heri-

tage, limitations imposed by the Dutch language, and from lack of a great dramatic literature. The bulk of productions in any season are foreign plays in translation. Shortly after World War II, in an effort to correct this, the Government of the Netherlands gave grants to three distinguished Dutch novelists to encourage them to write for the stage. Sadly, no great play has come of it, but it has been a noble, though limited, experiment.

The National Theatre of Belgium, like the country, is bilingual. The Flemish-speaking National Theatre is in Antwerp, and its French-speaking counterpart is in Brussels. There are commercial theatres, playing in both languages. The National Theatre in Brussels has grown in strength and repute. This year they have a new theatre building under construction and the company played an engagement in a repertory of two plays at the St. James Theatre in London.

THE ITALIAN THEATRE

The country in which theatre has declined almost to the point of non-existence is Italy. For a country which over the centuries has given to the world ballet, opera, great actors and great plays, this to my thinking is most pitiable. Production of plays is sporadic; one hears reports of an occasional fine production or the exceptional playing of a single actor or actress. Most distressing of all is the disinclination of members of the profession in Italy to hope for a revival of a healthy theatre.

The crisis in Italian theatre parallels that of theatres throughout the world, but with a difference. Working against a tradition of theatre as a cultural force is the traditional insularity of Italian cities. The unification of Italy long ago became a political fact but not a cultural fact. The cities of Italy are relatively small communities by comparison with those of other countries. Without an enormous government subsidy, such as opera receives, extensive touring is a must for any theatrical company. There is the rub. The acceptance and approval of a production of a play by Roman audiences does not insure success in Milan, Venice, Florence or any other Italian city. Audiences are likely to stay away, perversely, because of the accolade of a rival city.

The spectacle, a weakness in the Italian theatre, is very much alive. In 1949, Luchino Visconti produced in the Boboli Gardens in Florence a lavish outdoor production of *Troilus and Cressida* in the manner of a renaissance spectacle. Millions of lire were spent and lost for three performances. Despite the fact that reports of the production

still glow and have made many Italians as well as tourists wish to see this production of *Troilus and Cressida*, no producer in Italy is prompted to revive it yearly, as has been done with *Everyman* at Salzburg. Why? Signora Capadoglio says that the Italian, by temperament, quickly tires of a production as might a child with a toy. This has happened with lavish productions at Ostia in the Old Roman theatre as well as with government financed productions in the old Greek theatres in Sicily. It seems that as long as Italy remains an impoverished country, and feels inferior because of poverty, the individual Italian will spend nearly all he makes on what he considers his prime necessity, his clothes, while the theatrical entrepreneurs will be interested only in lavish spectacle and big, costly and wasteful effect. Coupled with this is a tendency to rest on the laurels of the past and a seeming incapacity to face the future—in respect to theatre—optimistically.

THE THEATRE IN GERMANY

Devotion to theatre and music throughout Germany is a well-known story. At the close of the war, Gustav Grundgens, Germany's leading actor, was attracted to Dusseldorf by the only intact opera house in Germany. Leading actors, singers, and technicians also were attracted, and productions of plays and operas were instituted at once. For a time, actors and singers shared the opera house, and both enjoyed a state subsidy. Then money was offered to Grundgens' drama contingent to rebuild a burned-out theatre. It must have taken some courage to take that step, for with the promise of a theatre of their own was the stipulation that they would cease to be a completely subsidized company. However, Grundgens Schauspielhaus at Dusseldorf has achieved a *modus vivendi*, and has developed one of the very great theatres of the world, in all respects: acting, direction, decor, lighting and business organization. The soundness of the administration of the theatre in both its artistic and business policy has been tested in the last year by the absence of the original guiding force: Gustav Grundgens' illness has taken him out of his theatre and he has been recuperating in Italy.

The present manager of the Schauspielhaus told me their institution has met the economic challenge to theatre in a variety of ways. There is some income from tickets sold at the box office, and a small subsidy. But this alone would never have enabled them to produce a new repertory of fifteen plays each season, to hold a large company

of the best actors in Germany, to engage top-flight actors for guest appearances, and to employ a large staff of technicians and designers. The main source of income for the Schauspielhaus comes from the subscription series in Dusseldorf and from subscription series for single performances given in neighboring towns. This limited touring, more than any other factor, accounts for the success of this great repertory theatre, which is not a state theatre. It is a theatre with a mixed economy, and may suggest some solutions to theatre problems in other countries.

In its repertoire the theatre of Dusseldorf is more a world theatre than a German theatre. No significant playwright has appeared in Germany during or since the war. Most of the fifteen plays of past seasons were translations. Mixed with the German classics of Schiller, and Goethe, Hebbel and Hauptmann are French, Russian, English, Italian and American plays. *Unser Kleine Stadt*, the German title for Thornton Wilder's *Our Town*, was again in their repertory this year, and is considered a classic by German audiences. One thing mars this shining phenomenon in theatre and that is the note of pessimism that there will not appear significant new German plays.

IN EGYPT

For more than a footnote on the theatre of Egypt, time and space do not allow. To tell the full and very interesting story of the emergence of a native theatre in that ancient land would merit a paper in itself. However, since theatre has declined in some parts of the world, it is difficult to resist giving a few notes on a theatre that is coming into the world. Due to the strict interpretation of the fiat on creating graven images, as handed down by Moses and accepted by Mohammed, there has been almost no theatre in Moslem countries. The Karagoz, popularly known as the Shadow Puppets, was the very imaginative dodge which flourished in most Moslem countries. This traditional form of entertainment died out in Egypt; then in the middle 19th century, due to European influence in Egypt, western theatre made its appearance. In the wake of opera companies from Italy, touring troupes from England and France, a group of Egyptian actors banded together and gave a repertory of plays in arabic.

Briefly, the history of the Egyptian theatre is one of sporadic success and failure. However, since the close of the war, the rising tide of nationalism has given impetus to the theatre. There has been a government subsidy which has been

as much as 14 million piastres, or \$350,000. There are commercial theatres in addition to the subsidized troupes.

The theatre in Egypt is moving slowly and is having a struggle. The contemporary playwrights have catered to the taste of the public for romantic plays with extremes of sentimentality and violence. Playwright Hakim is the exception, and he is in the forefront of the playwrights. He has written poetic plays with intellectual content, and he favors symbolism.

A highly successful production of a new play can hope for at best a run of three weeks. To avoid making the judicious grieve, a play must be in classical arabic. However, the newly emancipated Egyptian woman, whose husband now likes to have her accompany him to public and social functions, understands poorly the classical arabic. Only the daughters of the very wealthy and the highly placed are likely to have had an education. This problem is a limiting factor for a large and popular audience for native theatre.

Despite the fact that this is a comparatively new indigenous art, there is an element of snobbery that plagues the theatre. Abdel Sidky, Intendant of the Theatre de l'Opera, told me, with a smile, that he knows of the problem some critics create for theatre in other parts of the Western world, but that he would prefer unfavorable recognition to no recognition. The Egyptian critic and journalist disdains reviewing any theatre or music which is not from Europe. The older generation, whose education has been European, whose preference in language is French, will go to see a third rate opera company from Italy but avoid attendance at a first rate play in their native language.

CONCLUSION

In the area of *tributary* theatre, Europe has much to learn from us; some are eager to know that story, to observe our tributary theatre in action. Contemporary American plays and musical comedies, with their strength, vitality, and freshness, have come to Europe, been seen, and *have* conquered. Participation in the Berlin Festivals, the Paris Festival in the Spring of 1952, the extensive touring of *Porgy and Bess*, and of our great symphony orchestras, all have helped penetrate a cultural iron curtain. One Italian intellectual, in a discussion of American plays and the recent tour of the New York City Center Ballet, suggested that the center of western culture may very well have shifted to the New World. That is a large and generous statement from a proud citizen of a country which feels that today it has little left but pride in its tradition and cultural leadership. *I hope that we can be as large and generous as my Italian friend and accept the possibility that we need two-way exchange with Europe.* Blind nationalism is destructive of many things, and certainly one of them, so important to us, is theatre. One aspect of *our* nationalism in theatre is that we think "we've tried everything". If such narrow thinking prevails, our diminished theatre will atrophy and die, the victim of gamblers, rapacious unions, and anti-intellectuals.

The most encouraging thing to bring back from a visit to theatre centers in Europe is the evidence that men of theatre are still seeking and testing ways to keep the art alive, to keep it healthy and inspiring. None of these ways is startlingly new, but some of them have never been adequately tested in our theatre.

Three American Ladies of Poesy

By Helen Gertrude Hicks

TO READ THREE POETS of any age, be they men or women, the object of the reading is always the same, namely: to give the sense of the writing, the whole sense, which is the synthesis of emotional and ideational meanings, both expressed and implied, in any piece of writing. To realize this synthesis is the problem of preparation and involves the realization that the writing is not a thing apart from the writer. In the field of poetry the finer the poet, indeed, the more he bequeaths of himself in his poetry. We who would read the

poets interpretatively should know the poets we would read; know of each "what ails thee, knight at arms, alone and palely loitering." To know the poet requires considerable study, as we would study to realize a character in a play in order to understand *why* he speaks as he does, and so ourselves to know *how* to speak in order to carry the full significance of *what* we speak in that character's name. In reading a poem aloud we are expressing the thoughts and emotions of another personality; we must interpret not only the poem

but the poet, and we must first know what we would interpret.

Amy Lowell

Of our three ladies of poesy, Amy Lowell herself has pondered over three of her sister poets and wondered about them as personalities in her long poem, *THE SISTERS*. Taking them by and large, she says, they are a queer lot, the women who write poetry, and she wonders what makes them do it, what force it is that chooses them to put down for all to read their innermost feelings and the ideas that stir them,— "the fragments" of themselves, she says. She is reminded that, being women, they are "already mother creatures," and being poets, also, bearing children of their hearts and minds, they are therefore, "double bearing, with matrices in body and in brain." She thinks, indeed, that this fact is the very reason why the women poets are so scarce. A queer lot, the women who write poetry? Perhaps, in the sense that they are singled out to scribble down the fragments of themselves, for the women poets do seem to reveal themselves more intimately than do the men. These revelations of themselves must be understood by the reader almost as if the reader were the poet herself: must be understood with an exactitude no less than a sympathy.

Amy Lowell thinks that to be both woman and poet the strength of forty-thousand Atlases is required for the simple everyday concerns, and very few women, indeed, have such strength; an Elizabeth Barrett, perhaps, a Christina Rossetti, an Emily Bronte, and the three American ladies of our title. Certainly Amy Lowell of Beacon Hill, Boston, and the World, had a furious strength and vigor agitating her mind and soul and body! Perhaps a better figure of classical reference for Amy Lowell's life was one long series of Herculean labors against ill health and frustration, to which her poetry is constantly testifying. She never gave up, as she herself puts it vigorously:

"I have not quailed;

I was all unmailed,

And naked I strove, 'tis my only vaunt."

It is important to the reader of Amy Lowell to know what she fought for as well as the fact that she fought. Her answer is vigorously, almost violently, offered in these lines:

"Happiness; we rarely feel it.

I would buy it, beg it, steal it,

Pay for it in coins of dripping blood

For this one transcendent good."

In seeking to know the poet, her own poetic lines are a primary source, but there are other sources as well. Really to understand her we should know the influences and experiences that shaped her into the personality she was, and to gain such awareness we must take the testimony of those who were her friends and associates, as well as her own words about herself and her work. Then in the light of all the facts that we can find about the poet, we must read her own poetic expression and absorb its style and flavor. Then we can know what we are reading and will have more assurance of projecting the poet's full meaning.

Here is Amy Lowell on herself: "I am glad I am an American and brought up like a boy, and glad for every single time that I have been spilt out of a carriage. There!" And in her diary at the age of fifteen she wrote with remarkable candor for a teen-ager that she was "a great, *rough*, masculine, strong thing. . ."; and that she was "ugly, fat, conspicuous, and dull — to say nothing of a very bad temper!"

It is true, she was ugly, fat, and conspicuous, but never dull, and she was strong; and she fought roughly, like a man, all her fifty-six years, for happiness, even though constant frustration was hers no matter how hard she fought. She writes in her first volume of the "curse" that was hers that never should she be fulfilled by love. The object of all her fighting, happiness, is a common goal of us all, though very few fight so hard or against such odds. Nevertheless, her senses were always on the *qui vive* in spite of agony and pain. Those five prancing steeds carried the chariot of her mind forward into vividness. To Amy Lowell clouds floating before the moon were no delicate wisps of filmy nothingness, but rather they were the "white mares of the moon" that rush about the sky —

Beating their golden hoofs upon
the glass of Heaven;

The white mares of the moon are all
standing on their hind legs

Pawing at the green porcelain doors
of the remote Heavens.

Fly mares!

Strain to the utmost,

Scatter the milky dust of stars,

Or the tiger sun will leap upon you
and destroy you

With one lick of his vermillion tongue.

"Fly, mares! strain to the utmost! . . . Scatter the milky dust of stars!" This is Amy Lowell, herself,

straining to the utmost, trying to recognize and reveal the sharp feeling along the burning-hot wires of her senses as they came into vivid contact with the world about her, the sights and sounds of it, the touch and smell of it, the very taste of it. She tells us that she could never hoard her emotions, as she says of Emily Dickinson, "only giving herself to cold paper." On the contrary at the conclusion of her "Free Fantasia on Japanese Themes" we find this revealing statement about herself:

"I would anything
Rather than this cold paper;
With outside, the quiet sun on the sides
of the burgeoning branches
And inside only my books."

When we understand the personality of Amy Lowell, it is not difficult to see how she wrote as she did with a "command of the laquered phase and the glazed figure," in the words of Louis Untermeyer; with her "pyrotechnique," he goes on to say, "which causes words to bloom and burst at the same moment as though issuing from firework flowerpots, her restless excitement provoking inanimate objects to a furious life of their own. . ."

Finally, after a sympathetic appreciation of the poet herself, we are ready with sharpened techniques of impression and polished techniques of expression, to help the poet speak aloud with something of the vivid vigor with which she originally "scribbled down, man-wise," the fragments of herself, to use her own words.

Emily Dickinson

In Emily Dickinson, a Pegasus of quite another color, we have a poet who is the absolute antithesis of Amy Lowell. Where Amy Lowell would take up civil and cultural cudgels and dominate strong-minded individuals at Town Meetings or groups of sophisticated men and women at her famous dinners, Emily Dickinson would hide behind the pillars in the hall of her father's house to listen to the music she loved being offered in the parlor, or she would glide like a wraith around the corner of a door if a guest suddenly appeared. Amy traveled the world over and looked at it with furious intensity, Emily stayed at home in her own backyard and entered into the world of the bees and birds, bounded on the east by the purple dawn and on the west by the red dusk, above by the ever changing sky and below by the ever changing earth. Amy loaded the camera of her mind with fine color film and trained it on everything she saw and felt; her pictures came out

sharp and clear and beautifully colored. Emily trained the telescope of her soul on that tenuous rim where the sight grows dim and beyond lies God, and we believe her when she says:

I never saw a moor,
I never saw the sea;
Yet know I how the heather looks,
And what a wave must be.

I never spoke with God,
Nor visited in heaven
Yet certain am I of the spot
As if the chart were given.

It would be fantastically absurd to read this quiet certitude of God and Nature in the same, almost furious, intensity of Amy Lowell, who cried "I would anything rather than this cold paper. . .", who elsewhere in the same poem burgeoned forth with:

I would experience new emotions,
Submit to strange enchantments,
Bend to influences
Bizarre, exotic,
Fresh with burgeoning.

Yet, failing to be aware of the personalities of the poets, too many readers offer their poems with little or no difference of color or tone, pace or rhythm. These readers fail to understand that to read aloud is to project the poet as much as the poem. The gift of the poem without the giver is barren indeed.

Emily Dickinson lived the entire fifty-six years of her life in Amherst, Massachusetts, save for one brief excursion to Washington, D. C. when her father was in Congress. For the last thirty years of her life, the Dickinson house and garden were her whole physical world. But within these self-imposed walls the world of nature was unlimited, almost overwhelming, and from this infinity she wrote simply, but nonetheless awesomely:

The murmur of a bee
A witchcraft yieldeth me.
If any ask me why
'Twere easier to die
Than tell.
The red upon the hill
Taket away my will;
If anybody sneer,
Take care, for God is here,
That's all.
The breaking of the day
Addeth to my degree;
If any ask me how,

Artist, who drew me so,
Must tell!

Emily Dickinson's family was very, very New England. Samuel G. Ward, a contemporary of the Dickinsons and friend of the family, is most illuminating on the New England character and on Emily herself. He reminds us that the early settlers came to New England to think their own thoughts unhindered. They conversed so long and so intensely with their own souls that they lost the art of communication with others; all of which may have been a very lofty occupation, but a very lonely one, too. Once in a great while there would come a Channing, an Emerson, a Webster in whom the gift of articulateness was lodged. But mostly, says, Mr. Ward, it was denied.

Emily Dickinson, while not a Hawthorne, nor an Elizabeth Peabody, was not completely articulate. In Mr. Ward's words, she was the "articulate inarticulate" speaking of the mysteries of bees, sunset, and sunrise, of moors and heather, of waves and sea, of Heaven and God; speaking of them eloquently with sure knowledge of their being, though she walked only the few steps from wall to wall of her own garden.

While it was by her own will that she was imprisoned in both physical and social restraint and rigidity, she nevertheless longed for an escape into a much larger world. For Emily, with her sights trained where "beyond lies God" longed to find out for herself what it was like across the bar. After one of her many severe illnesses she wrote of being "called back" with regret.

Just lost when I was saved!
Just felt the world go by!
Jus gird me for the onset of eternity,
When breath blew back,
And on the other side
I heard recede the disappointed tide!

Emily was not satisfied to stand here on earth, even so small and dear and complete a patch as her own garden, and train the telescope of her imagination upwards. She yearned to step up there and from that exalted place watch the centuries, "slow tramp and the cycles wheel."

Elinor Wylie

The third of our ladies of poesy, Elinor Wylie, is in my opinion the most complicated personality and the most profound of American women poets. Amy Lowell looked about her and took the imprint of images on her mind. She noted the colors, the shapes, the surrounding circumstances, and made of her mind a sensitized photographic color

film on which every picture was caught in sharp focus. Emily Dickinson looked up and sent her soul soaring into the rarefied atmosphere of the mystic rites of Nature and the mysteries of God. Her mind was a constant Emily-in-Wonderland. Elinor Wylie looked into her own soul for the why and what and how of herself, sitting in the dust of the earth at the feet of God. She searched long and agonizingly for answers to profound questions. What is life? What am I? Why am I here? How can I resolve the conflicts and pulls I feel within me? It is a great relief of charged emotions to cry out rebelliously "Christ! What are patterns for?" when one is bitter over the personal loss of a gallant lover in the wars. Elinor Wylie could not with one bursting heart's cry rid herself of turmoil, for there were too many kinds of turmoil, too confused and too complicated. Out of her conflict of Body, Mind, Heart and Soul, here is Elinor Wylie speaking!

The Body, long oppressed
And pierced, then prayed for rest
(Being but apprenticed to the other Powers);
And kneeling in that place
Implored the thrust of grace
Which makes the dust lie level with the
flowers.

Then did that fellowship
Of three, the Body strip;
Beheld his wounds, and none among them
mortal;

The Mind, severe and cool;
The Heart, still half a fool;
The fine-spun Soul, a beam of sun can startle.
These three, a thousand years
Had made adventurers
Amid all villainies the earth can offer,
Applied them to resolve
From the universal gulph
What pangs the poor material flesh
may suffer.

Who and what this extraordinary woman poet who broke herself into four component parts, be-ings unto themselves, and then forthwith held arguments among Heart, Mind, and Spirit over how long the Body should be suffered to endure? She was a radiant beauty, a brilliant and talented wit, a keen and challenging intelligence. She was the popular daughter of a prominent and wealthy family of Philadelphia and Washington society, who proudly traced their line straight back to the Puritans. In addition to the influences that em-

anated from these factors in her life, there were other potent forces.

The question is: Who were they? rather than what? They were five men who poured their influences over Elinor Wylie along with their deep affection — and a sixth, who was the real passion of her poetic soul. The five were grandfather McMichael, who early recognized the special gifts of his first grandchild and carefully fostered them; her father, Henry Hoyt, who with grandfather McMichael, was the affectionate stabilizing influence of his brilliant daughter; the young erratic sportsman husband, Philip Hichborn, who had little to give Elinor in her search for herself; and Horace Wylie, fifteen years her senior, who had a great deal to give her, and did so during the most important years of her life from twenty-five to thirty-six — those years when the personal philosophies are set and the twig is fixed as it is bent; and finally William Rose Benet, who cherished and protected her, now a full-blown but delicate flower in the garden of the poets, in the last four years of her life. The sixth powerful influence on Elinor Wylie she reveals in her novel *THE ORPHAN ANGEL*; he was Percy Bysshe Shelly.

Why did Elinor the fair, Elinor the lovable, Elinor the brilliant, in her short forty-two years turn from one of these men to another in such quick succession? There is no pat answer in any book on a teacher's desk; nor has she herself said in so many words. Yet it is important to know the answer to this question in order to understand this searching soul. It is to be found, I believe, in her poems, if the reader will but exercise his sensitive perceptions and put together the facts of her life with the revealing implications of her own expression. Here in this short poem, which she calls *Sanctuary*, is her own answer. Each of these five men in Elinor Wylie's life offered her a haven, a protective sanctuary, until the fear came that her spirit might be walled in. In these lines she welcomes the building of her sanctuary with ecstasy, then suddenly comes the fear.—

This is the bricklayer; hear the thud
Of his heavy load dumped down on stone.
His lustrous bricks are brighter than blood,
His smoking mortar whiter than bone.
Set each sharp-edged, fire-bitten brick
Straight by the plumb-line's shivering length;
Make a marvelous wall so thick
Dead nor living may shake its strength.

Full as a crystal cup with drink
Is my cell with dreams, and quiet, and cool...
Stop, old man! You must leave a chink;
How can I breathe? *You can't, you fool!*

We have noted that Elinor Wylie was constantly searching for the answers to the questions about herself: who, what am I? Finally, she puts down her answer in these lines:

Now let no charitable hope
Confuse my mind with images
Of eagle and of antelope;
I am in nature none of these.
I was, being human, born alone;
I am, being woman, hard beset;
I live by squeezing from a stone
The little nourishment I get.
In masks outrageous and austere
The years go by in single file;
But none has merited my fear,
And none has quite escaped my smile.

In all her poems it is plain that she feels the conflicting pulls of the desires of the flesh and those of the spirit.

When her beauty was blighted by a stroke leaving a disfigured facial paralysis, she could not endure either herself or life. She could not wait for the slow withering of the flower and took the matter into her own hands as soon as, with meticulous care, she had made ready her last book of verses for the publisher.

These be my three American ladies of poesy.
Paraphrasing Amy Lowell a little as she goes dreaming on in love with her "spiritual relations":

... . For, after all,
A poet is flesh and blood as well as brain;
And Mrs. Wylie, or Emily Dickinson,
Or indeed Amy Lowell herself,
Was very, very woman. Well, there are *three*
Of them, and vastly unlike that's for certain.
Unlike at least until we tear the veils
Away which commonly gird souls. . . .
Good-by, my sisters, all of you are great,
And all of you are marvelously strange.

NOTE

The poems quoted, with permission of the publishers, are from Amy Lowell's *Sword Blades and Poppy Seed*, 1914; *Pictures of the Floating World*, 1919; and *What's O'Clock*, 1925, all published by Houghton Mifflin; from Emily Dickinson's *Complete Poems*, 1924; and *Poems Series I*, 1923, both published by Little, Brown; and from Elinor Wylie's *Collected Poems*, 1952, published by Alfred Knopf.

Trends In Speech In The Eastern States

—Edited by: Carroll C. Arnold

Educational Television

IN THE JANUARY ISSUE of TODAY'S SPEECH this department called attention to the educational television series being telecast over station WABD through co-operation of the four New York City colleges, the New York City Board of Higher Education, and the DuMont television network. This series, called, "Panorama," was hailed in the press as an undertaking which "may set TV education patterns for the nation." On February 11, 1954, after sixteen programs had been telecast, New York newspapers reported that Joseph B. Cavallaro, Chairman of the Board of Higher Education, had announced "the Board withdraws its program from DuMont, effective immediately." Reasons for the sudden withdrawal according to press reports, were that "of the sixteen programs prepared by the Board since the series went on the air October 24, commercial programs pre-empted the entire allotted time of four and delayed one seven minutes and another twenty-one."

The future of this important educational television venture is uncertain at this writing but the difficulties cited by the Board of Higher Education lend support to the familiar argument that in any collaboration between educational and commercial broadcasters and telecasters, educational interests are at the mercy of commercial interests. Whether such a conflict of interests is inevitable is, of course, by no means clear. A number of universities, colleges, and secondary schools in the Eastern states have worked successfully with commercial television stations for several years and the current tendency appears to be toward rather than away from such co-operation.

The relationship between Syracuse University and station WSYR-TV is probably typical of the most successful collaborative efforts. The origin and characteristics of the Syracuse plan are indicated in the following excerpts from a recently issued brochure entitled "Graduate Training in Television":

"For three years the problems of Syracuse University's entrance into television were discussed at staff meetings. . . . The problem was to select the aspect of television on which major emphasis was to be placed.

"In 1949 the Department decided to continue its emphasis on training by building a television program which would prepare personnel for stations, agencies, universities and other participants in the American system of television.

"In the Spring of 1950 a television studio was installed on the campus. . . . A contract was drawn up between the University and WSYR-TV whereby the campus studio would be linked by direct cable with the station so that both sponsored and sustaining programs might be aired. . . . Programs telecast from the University studio are either educational programs planned and produced by the University staff and graduate students or commercial programs presented by WSYR-TV for its sponsors using students in all crew jobs. . . WSYR-TV is a basic NBC affiliate."

For the past three years this arrangement has worked to the mutual advantage of station WSYR-TV and the Department of Radio-Television. Some part of its success may be attributed to the fact that the University and the station had for twelve years collaborated in educational-commercial radio broadcasting. During the period of their association in telecasting the University and commercial station have successfully produced a great variety of programs: series of programs aimed at interpreting the work of various departments of the University, "one-shot" performances, experimental programs testing different program formats, public events features, etc.

Temple University, like Syracuse, has long maintained successful producing and programming relations with local commercial stations. Lehigh University at Bethlehem, Pennsylvania has recently undertaken a series of programs, telecast over the facilities of commercial station WLEV-TV and intended to interpret for the public the work of various departments in the University. Professor David C. Phillips of the University of Connecticut reports that two New England commercial television stations have proposed that each of several colleges and universities supply two plays each year to a series of collegiate dramatic programs. A number of secondary schools, too, have informal or contrac-

tual production arrangements with local telecasters.

To date, then, collaboration between academic divisions of Speech, Drama, or Television and commercial television stations has been inevitable if outlets were to be secured for educational programs. However, Pittsburgh and several other Eastern cities will soon have noncommercial educational television stations. These will provide alternative outlets but also introduce new and different problems in administration, finance, programming, and production. Indeed, it is by no means certain that Eastern educational institutions will find it invariably advantageous to substitute arrangements with noncommercial stations for their present policies. The nation's first noncommercial station, KUHT-TV, Houston, Texas, has operated with considerable success for nearly a year, but reports concerning this station indicate that high costs and small viewing audiences are likely to plague most purely educational stations. From some educational viewpoints programming for the select audiences of educational TV stations may not offer the training opportunities needed.

An especially interesting and controversial proposal for easing the conflict of interests (real or alleged) between educational and commercial interests and for spreading more widely the costs of noncommercial telecasting was introduced in the New York State Legislature on February 8 of this year. The bill, simultaneously offered in Senate and Assembly, would empower the New York State Board of Regents to incorporate any group, institution, or association to construct, own and operate a nonprofit, noncommercial educational television station, or to provide educational television programs for use on commercial stations. Corporations of this sort would be required to operate under the supervision and control of the Board of Regents. The bill is the outgrowth of the recommendations submitted in 1953 by a special state commission on the use of television for educational purposes. By a 10-5 vote this commission declared that expenditure of state funds to construct and operate a chain of ten educational stations seemed unjustified at present and recommended, instead, use of private funds through specially created corporations authorized to build one or more stations on an experimental basis. The New York Legislature had not yet taken final action on the Koerner-Ashbery bill at the time of this writing.

As more and more schools and colleges gain experience in administering and producing educational television programs much will be learned about the arrangements and programs which best serve educational objectives. The editor of "Trends" is anxious to receive and pass on to the general readership the results of such experience and solicits communications on this subject from academic, industrial, and professional people interested and experienced in educational broadcasting and telecasting.

Interdepartmental Programs

"Trends" has heretofore noted the increasing collaboration between faculties of Speech and Drama and of Education at various colleges and universities in the Eastern states. Another step of this sort has recently been taken at Cornell University. Although cadet teachers are not required to take courses in Speech, each prospective teacher will hereafter be examined by a special committee composed of one representative of the faculty of Education, one representative of the Speech Clinic, and one other member of the Department of Speech and Drama. Each student will speak, read, and engage in informal conversation after which the examining committee will consider whether or not the student needs formal work in Speech. Where inadequacies are discovered, students may be referred to the Speech Clinic or advised to enroll for regular courses in speech improvement, oral reading, or public speaking. The faculties involved have preferred this program over formal speech requirements for teachers-in-training because it offers an opportunity to tailor instruction to the needs of each individual and because the faculties will be able to share in the formulation of the standards of oral expression to which all cadet teachers should be held.

Drama and the Theatre for High-School Students

A sixteen-program radio series explaining the modern theatre to high-school students will soon be available for general use. This announcement is contained in a feature article by Judith Crist appearing in the New York *Herald Tribune* for January 31, 1954. The series is now being broadcast weekly to New York City high schools by station WNYE, FM station of the NYC Board of Education, and it is the "dreamchild" of Miss Jean A. Eicks, a high school teacher of Speech and Drama turned educational broadcaster. The pro-

grams, which began on February 2, are to be recorded and made available for distribution throughout the country by the National Association of Educational Broadcasters. According to the *Herald Tribune* report authorities in Atlanta, St. Louis, Minneapolis, Cleveland, and rural areas of Minnesota have already requested use of the recorded series.

The "On Stage" programs, Miss Eicks says, "are intended to stimulate interest in the legitimate theatre and build the theatre audience of the future in today's classrooms." Prominent critics, directors, designers, stage managers, actors, and others connected with the New York stage discuss their roles and problems in the theatre in fifteen-minute interviews. A study guide has also been prepared for use in classrooms. Miss Eicks insists that the programs "are not for the stagestruck, because the interviewees have been nothing if not realistic in their approach." A special letter-writing contest is sponsored in conjunction with the New York City broadcasts. The subject for the contest letters: "I would Like to See a Professional Production."

At Binghamton (N. Y.) Central High School Miss Helen M. Foley directs another ambitious but more limited program aiming at bringing classic as well as modern drama and theater into the classroom. During the first semester of Miss Foley's one-year elective course in Dramatics students study the Greek and Roman theatre, undertake a classroom production of *Everyman*, and study such other representative plays as *Antigone*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *School for Scandal*, *Iolanthe*, *A Doll's House*, *Lady Windermere's Fan*, *The Hairy Ape*. During the second semester Binghamton students approach their subject through special projects in dramatic production. Production of a three-act play, special dramatic programs for elementary-school audiences, and radio and television programs are typical activities for which students take responsibility. Special problems for research and experimentation also develop from these projects. Students in this program develop maturity and responsibility, sensitivity to problems in diction and oral expression, as well as knowledge about and interest in the theatre, Miss Foley reports.

But even such classroom aids as the WNYE "On Stage" recordings, not to speak of courses in dramatic literature and production, must lose much of their force where the lore and craft of the theatre are insufficiently known to teachers

charged with their presentation. It is, therefore, a good omen that the University of Rhode Island Extension Center at Newport has inaugurated a course in directing, primarily for those teachers in the Newport school system who have responsibility for dramatic activities. Professor Robert Will of the University of Rhode Island, who offers this course, devotes special attention to the problems of producing and directing plays with elementary and secondary school students. Doubtless other such in-service-training programs are being offered in the Eastern states but few have come to the attention of this department.

College Curricula and Pedagogy

One of the persistent problems for all teachers of performance courses in Speech and Drama is to discover the means by which students' achievement may be represented in both analytical and generally descriptive form. Rating and criticism forms are, consequently, numerous, but Mrs. Marion Robinson, Associate Professor of Speech at Goucher College, has suggested a performance-evaluation form developed upon principles which may be new to many of "Trends" readers.

Professor Robinson has sought to design a rating sheet which will at once provide each student with detailed analysis of the various features of his performance and still offer a clear indication of his overall achievement relative to class standards. These two objectives Professor Robinson achieves in her "Overt Speech Behavior Profile" by aligning idealized statements about speech behavior at one side of the rating form and statements expressing inadequacies in the same aspects of behavior at the opposite side of the form. On the continuum of excellence to deficiency, thus formed for each aspect of speech, the observer may mark his judgment in relation to a vertical midline representing adequacy. By simply connecting, vertically, the individual evaluations represented upon the various linear scales, the observer can give the generalized, visible representation or "profile" of the student's total effectiveness in relation to whatever standards of "adequacy" are used in the course.

While Professor Robinson's method of expressing detailed and general evaluations might be used to evaluate almost any qualities sought in any form of communication, the qualities evaluated in the basic speech course at Goucher are: general communication of thought, relationship with audience, use of body, use of language, pitch, timing, rhythm, vocal force, and vocal quality.

In Speech 1 at Goucher students work in pairs, helping each other by using the rating scale in the same manner as does the instructor.

At Queens College four laboratory workshops in acting, theatre production, debate and discussion, and broadcasting have been established in order to encourage participation in the presentational aspects of the speech arts. Any students may enter these workshops for or without college credit.

The Department of Speech and Dramatic Art at Temple University has recently revised its requirements for the Master's degrees in Arts and in Education. Areas of concentration acceptable under the new program are: rhetoric and public address, speech education, dramatic arts, radio and television, speech correction and audiology, or an acceptable combination of these areas. Candidates for the Master's degree may choose either a thesis program or a non-thesis program. In the former, twenty-four semester hours of credit in courses plus an acceptable thesis are required; in the latter program, thirty semester hours of credit in approved courses plus successful completion of a comprehensive examination in the major area of study are required. All candidates are required to register for the department's course, Introduction to Graduate Study.

Speech in Industry

At Syracuse and Binghamton, New York, speech education for adults employed in industry has developed in interesting and somewhat unusual ways.

Early in 1953, a Management Development Program for industries in Syracuse was inaugurated under the joint sponsorship of Syracuse University's University College and the Manufacturers' Association of Syracuse. As now operated, the Program consists of eight units of instruction, comprising seventy-one two-hour sessions offered during company-released time. Two of the eight units of instruction are concerned with Speech: Effective Oral Communication and Conducting Conferences and Meetings. Classes are generally limited to twenty students but for the unit on conference leadership, classes are limited to ten students. The two units concerned with Speech are taught by Professor J. Calvin Callaghan, Chairman of the Department of Public Address in the Syracuse University School of Speech. Other units of instruction in the Program deal with industrial organization, effective reading, effective writing,

investigating for facts, and self-development. The initial group receiving this training is made up of management personnel from eight different Syracuse industries.

Under the auspices of the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations Extension Division at Cornell, a somewhat similar program conducted for the Triple Cities Industrial Management Club is in its third year of operation. Begun in Binghamton, New York, at the request of the Management Club in 1952, the first offering was an eight-week basic course in Conference Methods attended by two representatives from each of ten industrial concerns in Binghamton, Endicott, and Johnson City. In 1953, the School of Industrial and Labor Relations again filled the Management Club's request that the previous year's course be repeated for a new group of industrial supervisors and junior administrators. When a similar request was made for 1954, representatives of the School of Industrial and Labor Relations suggested that an advanced course in Conference Leadership and Participation be offered for those who had completed either previous course, thus qualifying these persons to conduct future Club programs of instruction in conference methods. Under this arrangement Mr. S. J. Savereid of the Cornell Department of Speech and Drama is currently instructing a specially selected class of Triple Cities Industrial Management Club members. All enrollees have had at least one basic course in conference methods.

Professor Edward H. Sargent of the Central District Office, NYSSILR Extension Division, reports that a first course in conference methods will also be started at the Ithaca, New York, Industrial Management Club. Whether the School of Industrial and Labor Relations will subsequently sponsor an advanced course enabling Club members in Ithaca to inaugurate their own training program will depend upon the success of the Binghamton experiment as well as upon interest in Ithaca.

Meetings of Special Interest

The Speech Association of America will have a one day program as part of the Annual Convention of the National Education Association, which meets in New York June 27-July 2, 1954. The Speech program will be held on Monday, June 28, at Teachers College, Columbia University.

Soon after the departure of NEA delegates another program of general interest will be offered

at Teachers College, Columbia University. This will be a workshop in language arts sponsored by the Department of Curriculum and Teaching, the Department of the Teaching of English, and the Department of the Teaching of Speech and Dramatics. The workshop will run from July 5 through July 9. Mornings will be devoted to general sessions and afternoons to participation in language arts activities. There will be afternoon sessions in Creative Dramatics, Oral Interpretation of Literature, Choral Speaking, Speech Improvement. Information concerning this workshop may be secured by writing to Magdalene Kramer, Chairman of the Department of Speech and Dramatics,

Teachers College, Columbia University.

Since there is no statewide organization of teachers of Speech and Drama, the sixth annual Speech Conference to be held at the Teachers College of Connecticut in New Britain on April 3 will have special interest this year. Professor Brodbery P. Ellis reports that in addition to a program featuring instruction and demonstration in choral speaking, led by Professor Magdalene Kramer of Teachers College, Columbia University, and a statewide drama festival, plans for forming a state organization of speech teachers will be given special consideration. Such an organization was first proposed and discussed formally at Hartford in October 1953.

Significant Research In The Eastern States

—Guest Editor: Elton S. Carter

Rightly conceived, a laboratory is not ingenious technical instruments. Whatever a man, woman or child thinks — wherever a human being observes, identifies, remembers, imagines, combines, reasons and judges — there is a laboratory; and it is my contention that, when thinking aims, consciously or unconsciously, to establish some [empirical] proposition respecting no matter what subject-matter or aspect of the world, the laboratory ought to be regarded a scientific one.

—C. J. KEYSER

IF ONE OF YOUR COLLEAGUES walked up to you one day and asked, "Have you done or are you doing any significant research?" — what would you say and why? It would depend, wouldn't it, on how you interpreted the "question"? The contexts should make a difference: the verbal context or what else was said, and the situational context or the circumstances in which the conversation took place. Who did the asking might make a difference, too. And so, at different times, you might not give the same answer. But you might be expected to give *similar* answers at different times, answers indicative of how you interpret and evaluate and classify your work.

Our attention is called to these very important considerations every time information is solicited

for this Section of *Today's Speech*. "Have you done or are you doing any significant research?" Most of us sat on our hands. Why? A few decided that what they had done or what they were doing is properly classified as research of some significance. Why? What goes on here? What distinguishes the few from the many? Lots of things, of course. But would it be accurate to conclude that only a few had done any significant research?

Let me be the first to confess. I was asked the "question." Half consciously, I answered it for myself. I misinterpreted what was asked, mis-evaluated what I had been doing, and therefore did not classify it as research. I classified it as writing, just as if Iline Fife and I could prepare a manuscript of a book for publication without doing any research. Isn't that ridiculous? I know better. So do you. But meanwhile *Today's Speech* didn't get the information needed to serve us all properly. Why?

Perhaps we're too modest, too busy, too lackadaisical, too stupid, etc. If so, what's the remedy? What's the use of branding ourselves with epithets which open no doors to practical solutions? We can do better than that. We know we can because we have.

In the first place, we can agree that we have a problem which deserves a practical solution. Let's state our problem for discussion: How can we provide ourselves with accurate information about

one another's significant research activities?

Also, and this is the crux of the matter, we can recognize that "Have you done or are you doing any significant research?" is *not* really a question any more than "x is a commandment of the decalogue" is a proposition in the strictly logical sense. (Now please excuse the jargon, but there is no satisfactory substitute.) The latter statement is not properly classified as a proposition but a propositional function because it's neither true nor false, but ambiguous. Likewise, the former is not properly classified as a question but an interrogational function because it does not have one answer but many *answers*, with each answer depending on how it is *interpreted*. That is to say, out of all the meanings it might have, what does it mean to each of us at particular times, in particular circumstances? Now that's a question. Each of us can answer it. How we answer it depends upon what the terms *research* and *significant* mean to us as used in particular contexts. Well, what do they mean to you when our research editor does his soliciting?

You will pardon me, I'm sure, for recommending an extremely obvious thing to do. I don't mean to show any disrespect: it's just that "in the matter of escaping attention, what is very obvious is a rival of what is obscure." The obvious thing to do

is to get hold of a good dictionary, look up *research* and *significant*, and actually study their usages. Do you find under "research" anything to indicate the necessity of a white coat and test tubes? Anything which eliminates a proper application of the term from what each of us *must* do almost daily in order to be a good teacher, a good citizen? My old *Webster's* says, "careful search; a close searching. Studious inquiry; usually, critical and exhaustive investigation or experimentation *having for its aim the revision of accepted conclusions, in the light of newly discovered facts.*" Notice the "exhaustive"; can you take that literally? (If so, look it up, too.) Notice the "or"; too many people don't. Notice what I've underscored; it points to the only *kind* of aim which keeps us from withering on the vine. Do we want our colleagues to think we have so little to do with research?

Significant? Look that one up, too, bearing in mind that *Today's Speech* couldn't afford the space to publish accounts of all the research we do. Significant research? Significant to whom? To you and to me, of course, to all the readers of *Today's Speech*? This reminds us of the students who pass up a wealth of excellent subjects for speeches because "they (the audience) wouldn't be interested in *that*." Of course "they" would; wouldn't you?

Today's Speech Books In Review

—Edited by: Arthur Eisenstadt

THE EARLY YEAR OFFERINGS in our field include some rather good items, which give promise of pleasant times, bookwise, in the months ahead. In the public speaking area, an improved second edition of *Fundamentals of Public Speaking*, by Bryant and Wallace, makes a happy appearance. The Campbell-Winans influence and considerable attention to outlining and preparing support material still prevail, as well they might. The procedure of giving early general treatment to first speeches and later amplifying these same points is a very useful one, and the format has been handsomely vivified. Heartily recommended.

Somewhat broader treatment of the oral disciplines is found in the new College Outline Series handbook, *Speech*, by Dorothy Mulgrave, to which chapters have been contributed by Wilbur Gilman and Wilbert Pronovost. The range of

subject matter under Speech Arts includes semantics, argumentation, group discussion, interpretation, dramatics, and radio speech. Part two, Speech Sciences, treats hearing, diction, voice, vowels, diphthongs, consonants, and pathology. Necessarily, brevity limits full development of these many fields, but tight organization pattern, compact manner of presentation and succinct writing style give admirable coverage and valuable perspective to this work.

A forthright exposition of public speaking for the busy, relatively untrained adult may be gained from the NRB *Public Speaking Manual*, put out by the National Research Bureau. In large, loose-leaf binder form, this work deals with preparation, speech writing, delivery, special problems and source material. Despite the serious absence of anything like audience analysis and specific guides

for audience adaptation, much sound, practicable information is imparted in brisk, readable hypodermic fashion. Some excellent material on self analysis and how to control nervousness is included, and an ingenious tab system simplifies locating desired items of information.

From the energetic pen of Alice Sturgis comes a new text, *Learning Parliamentary Procedure*. The material is presented in three parts: Procedure: Principles and General Rules, Motions and their use, and the Structure and Function of Organizations. Based on past experience and new research on six national societies like the bar and medical associations, and labor, business and consumer groups, a very considerable amount of up-to-date and first-hand data is given. A clear, sensible manner of writing, much practice material, and many sprightly and pertinent illustrations in picture or verse form round out this attractive work.

Every so often, one reads a text which presents a collection of articles or excerpts and is left with the reaction, "What does it all add up to?" Perusal of *Speech Therapy, A Book of Readings*, seems to add up to the realization that speech correction has genuinely achieved the status of a profession, and that Van Riper is to be congratulated on helping to make this apparent to the medical and lay worlds. With a minimum of editorial comment, nearly one hundred eighty articles cover the fields of voice, rhythm, diction, professional problems, aphasia, cleft palate, cerebral palsy, and foreign dialect. Stuttering seems to loom disproportionately large as contrasted to vocal disorders and foreign dialect, but this reviewer applauds the substantial exposition of the motokinesthetic method, so often left obscured. Format, type and, above all, very intelligent editing make this a most commendable book.

Dramaturgists (hm!) and theatre-goers alike will be fascinated and to some degree edified by *Curtain Time*, written by Lloyd Morris, co-author of *The Damask Cheek* and sometime drama critic. Lucid in style and affectionate in manner, a running history of American theatre from the early nineteenth century down to 1953 is furnished the reader, largely by biographing the major acting figures of each era. His treatment of John Barrymore, for example, is an adroit combination of perceptive character delineation and deft blocking-in of the actor's milieu: friends, enemies, theatrical tradition of the time, and the current dramatic principles. The closing pages treat over-brief-

ly the future of the American theatre, the decline of serious drama in New York, and the growth of "little theatres" in various parts of the country. Notwithstanding this, the book is highly informative, specific and worthwhile, and the reader is urged to be on hand for *Curtain Time*.

Serving as a milestone in the progress of television is *Television in School, College, and Community*, by Jennie Waugh Callahan. It is one of the earliest books—the first, according to its publisher—to deal exclusively with educational television, and is based on several years of quite intensive, country-wide personal investigation. One of the author's purposes is to report in accurate detail what has been done in various schools and communities, and this is ably and comprehensively carried out. Scripts, reports from areas, an extensive bibliography which includes unpublished research efforts, and the needs of the field are all given discussion. A very helpful review of the history of educational TV orients the balance of the book, and the trend to coordinating script-writing with production problems is well brought out, as are the possibilities of "telecourses" offering college credit. Dr. Callahan has helped to focus attention on a new and extremely vivid aspect of education, and to point out to educators of all disciplines what an inherent power is theirs as molders of the communities of the future.

Books Reviewed

- Mulgrave, Dorothy, *Speech*. New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1954. 270 pp. \$1.50.
 Bryant, D. C. and Wallace, K. R., *Fundamentals of Public Speaking*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1953. 493 pp.
 National Research Bureau, *Public Speaking Manual*. Chicago: National Research Bureau, Inc., 1953. 237 pp.
 Sturgis, Alice F., *Learning Parliamentary Procedure*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1953. 358 pp. \$5.50.
 Van Riper, Charles, *Speech Therapy, A Book of Readings*. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1953. 319 pp. \$3.95.
 Morris, Lloyd, *Curtain Time*. New York: Random House, Inc., 1953. 380 pp. \$5.00.
 Callahan, Jennie W., *Television In School, College, and Community*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1953. 339 pp. \$4.75.

Audio-Visual Materials

Our January issue gave a number of general sources from which many types of visual aids might be secured. We here list several other sources, and some of the specific aids available.

1. Educational Screen, 64 E. Lake St., Chicago, Ill. *One Thousand and One, The Blue Book on Non-Theatrical Films*. (\$1.00).
2. Encyclopedia Britannica Films, Wilmette, Ill. *Encyclopedia Britannica Films and Filmstrips*. (free).
3. General Motors, Detroit, Mich. *General Motors 1952-53 Motion Picture Catalog*. 66p. (free loan films).

4. United Nations Department of Public Information, *United Nations Film Strip Catalog*. (free).
5. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. 3,434 *U. S. Government Films*, 329 p. No. FS5.3:951/21 (\$70).
6. ———, *Three-Dimensional Teaching Aids For Trade and Industrial Instruction*. 91 p. No. FS5.4:366 (\$45).
7. ———, *102 Motion Pictures On Democracy*. 51 p. No. FS5.3:950/1 (\$20).
8. Young America Films, Inc., 18 E. 41st Street, New York 17, N. Y. *Young America Films Catalog*. Includes a speech series. (free).

Visual Aids on Industry

Industry: Standard Oil Co., Room 1626, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, N. Y. 20, N. Y. A. M. Byers Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, N. Y. 20, N. Y. Revere Copper and Brass, Inc., 230 Park

Avenue, New York, N. Y. Baker and Co., Inc., 113 Astor Street, Newark 5, N. J. Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Coal Co., 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y. Inland Steel Co., 38 S. Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois. Union Carbide and Carbon Corp., 30 E. 42nd Street, New York 17, N. Y. General Electric, Schenectady 5, New York. Kay Electric Co., Pinebrook, N. J. Bell Telephone Labs., 463 West Street, New York 14, N. Y. Burgess-Manning Co., Chicago, Illinois. Western Union Telephone Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York 13, N. Y. Radio and TV: RCA International Division, 745 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. Farnsworth TV and Radio Company, Fort Wayne 1, Indiana.

An Opportunity

(Continued from page 1)

—at 1:30 p. m., problems of hearing disability will be presented by William G. Hardy and Dr. Miriam Paule, who will present several children with hearing losses and discuss their problems and treatment.

Theatre

FRIDAY, APRIL 9, at 1:00 p. m., "Repertory Theatre," discussed by John Deiter.

SATURDAY, APRIL 10, at 9:15 a. m., "Children's Theatre," discussed by Grace M. Stanistreet.

—at 1:30 p. m., "Theatre Technique," discussed by Dean Finne, Vance Morton, Gertrude Walsh, Helen Roach and John Hazleton.

Oral Interpretation

FRIDAY, APRIL 9, at 2:45 p. m., discussion by Nadine Shepardson, Gerald Marsh and Josephine Callan.

SATURDAY, APRIL 10, at 9:15 a. m., "Oral Interpretation as an Aid in Overcoming Personality Difficulties," discussed by Helen Hicks, Magdalene Kramer and James Bender.

General Semantics

FRIDAY, APRIL 9, at 2:45 p. m., discussion by Harry Weinberg, Elton Carter, Parks Burgess and George Field.

SATURDAY, APRIL 10, at 9:15 a. m., "The Revolution in Communication," discussed by Gilbert Seldes, Alice Pentlarge, Josephine Lees and David Mackey.

Speech Education

SATURDAY, APRIL 10, at 1:30 p. m., "Language Arts in the Elementary Schools," discussed by Dorothy Hoyle, Helen Donovan, Helen Miller, Miriam Wilt and Virginia Palmer.

—at 1:30 p. m., "Planning the High School Course in Speech," discussed by Evelyn Konigsberg, Mildred Hahn Enterline, Thomas A. Morsey and Jacob B. Zack.

OUR AUTHORS

Marvin Bauer (Ph. D., Wisconsin), Professor of Speech at Brooklyn is President of the Speech Association of the Eastern States. Ralph Schmidt (Ph. D., Syracuse) sends from Utica another of his practical articles. Harold P. Zelko (whose M. A. is backed by an LL.B.) has returned to his professorship at Penn State after organizing the new training program for the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Goodwin Berquist (an M. A. candidate at Penn State), is represented by his first published article. Ross Scanlon (Ph. D. Cornell), Profes-

sor of Speech at City College, N. Y. C., is an expert on propaganda analysis.

The theatre discussions are by Andrew Erskine (Ph. D. N. Y. U.) who heads the Drama division at Muhlenberg and John D. Mitchell, Drama Director at Manhattan College, whose M. A. at Northwestern has been succeeded by extensive study of the theatre abroad. Helen Gertrude Hicks (M. A., Michigan) presents the first of six "ladies of poesy," with the others to be discussed in a subsequent issue. Elton Carter (Ph. D., Northwestern) is Associate Professor of Speech at Penn State.

**The
Pennsylvania
State
University
Summer
Sessions
1954**

More than 600 academic, professional, and vocational courses on both the undergraduate and graduate levels included in total program.

One to 12 weeks of study and recreation in the cool, mountain environment of Penn State.

Moderate instructional fees and living expenses.

Educational Television Workshop — June 28 to August 7.

High School Speech Institute — June 14 to July 2.

Speech and Hearing Clinic Symposium on problems of children with brain injuries and cleft palates — June 19 to June 23.

Radio and Television Institute — July 7.

**Inter-Session
June 8 to June 25
Main Summer Session
June 28 to August 7
Post-Session
August 9 to August 27**

For bulletin information address:

Director of Summer Sessions
Room 105 Burrowes Building
THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
State College, Pennsylvania

**UNIVERSITY OF
PITTSBURGH**

1954 Summer Session

SIX WEEKS — JUNE 28 - AUGUST 6

A Full Program of Undergraduate
and Graduate Courses in Speech

Educational Television Workshop

The Role of Communications
in Human Relations

For information, address
DIRECTOR OF SUMMER SESSIONS
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh 13, Pennsylvania

**PRICE LIST
OF**

Reprints from
TODAY'S SPEECH

2 PAGES		4 PAGES	
50 copies	\$23.75	50 copies	\$28.00
150 copies	25.00	100 copies	30.00
150 copies	26.50	150 copies	32.00
500 copies	29.00	500 copies	37.50

HIMES PRINTING COMPANY, Inc.
326 WEST BEAVER AVENUE
STATE COLLEGE, PENNSYLVANIA
TELEPHONE: 2110

TODAY'S SPEECH

If you find TODAY'S SPEECH valuable, help build circulation by bringing this coupon to the attention of your friends, teachers, business men, professional men, club women, students.

Name

Address

(Other names and addresses may be attached)

Enclosed find \$..... Bill me \$.....

Start subscription with January, 1953

with January, 1954

with current issue

*Current subscribers may complete
their files by ordering*

TODAY'S SPEECH

Vol. I, No. 1 (April, 1953) 50c

Vol. I, No. 2 (October, 1953) 50c

Vol. II, No. 1 (January, 1954) 50c



Send subscriptions and checks to:

DR. MILTON J. WIKSELL

Subscription Manager

Shepherd College,

Shepherdstown, West Virginia

THE DIVISION OF SPEECH

in the

Department of English

Lehigh University

OFFERS COURSES IN

- ★ Speech Fundamentals
- ★ Business and Professional Speech
- ★ Debate
- ★ Radio
- ★ Dramatics
- ★ Parliamentary Law
- ★ Discussion

Students in the College of Arts and Sciences,

College of Engineering and the College

of Business are eligible to

enroll.

FOR INFORMATION WRITE TO

Prof. H. Barrett Davis

Head of the Division of Speech

Lehigh University

Bethlehem, Pennsylvania